TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 1761 02787703 4

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
TRINITY COLLEGE
TORONTO

TRINITY UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY,
S.H. 45 No.

MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, ... GEORGE HERBERT.

NEW YORK. . . . . CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

MESSIANIC PROPHECY:

Its Origin, Historical Growth, and Relation to New Testament Fulfilment.

By Dr. EDWARD RIEHM,
LATE PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN HALLE.

SECOND EDITION.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY
LEWIS A. MUIRHEAD, B.D.,

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
Professor A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D.,
NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1891.

320.1

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE studies which form the contents of this book were published originally in three parts in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*[1] (1865 and 1869). In compliance with frequent requests I allowed them to appear in 1875 as a separate work, of which an English translation was published in 1876 by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh. More than a year ago the book was sold off. The continuance of the demand for it, and the conviction that, apart from works on the same subject that had appeared in the interval, it still had a special mission to fulfil, decided me to publish a new edition. Apart from a reference to recent literature, the SECOND and THIRD PARTS will be found substantially unaltered. More important alterations, however, both as to form and matter, were found necessary in the FIRST PART, not because my views had changed, but because it was necessary to justify them against objections, and to secure them at various points from misunderstanding. May

[1] [*Theological Essays and Reviews*—a Magazine.—TR.]

the little book in its partly altered form help to further the design of its original conception "by making way for the conviction, that when full justice has been done to the principles of grammatical and historical exegesis, and due recognition given to all the well-established results of critical investigation of the Old Testament writings and history, the Divine revelations and deeds of the Old Covenant, preparatory to Christ and His Kingdom, so far from being obscured, appear rather in clearer light, because they emerge to view in more tangible historic reality."

DR. EDWARD RIEHM.

HALLE, 22*nd November* 1884.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

—o—

I TRUST I have not altogether failed in the endeavour to make this translation at once accurate and readable. It has had the advantage of being not only read, but for the most part carefully examined in proof by Dr. A. B. Davidson, New College, Edinburgh, to whom I owe more thanks in connection with my execution of the work than I can well here express. I am glad that he thinks favourably of the translation, and, while pleading guilty to the charge of using philosophical terms (see p. xviii), I have to say that in this respect I have certainly not gone beyond the example of the German original. The liberties I have taken with Riehm's text do not on the whole exceed those ordinarily conceded to a translator, but the few following explanations may not be amiss.

The italics are in the main those of Riehm, but there are naturally some divergences which did not seem to me of such importance as to require special indication. I have been so impressed by a sense of the importance of Riehm's work to the general reader and learner, as well as to the scholar, that I have

excluded *Greek* and *Hebrew characters*—in one or two cases even the words themselves — both from the text and the footnotes, and where the words *are* used, I have generally inserted English equivalents in brackets. With the exception perhaps of the use of *ch* (instead of *ḥ*) for ח, the system of transliteration adopted for the Hebrew words is that generally employed. Except in the name *Jehovah* (Yahᵉveh), no equivalent has been used for the silent simple *shᵉva.* For the composite *shᵉvas* I have used the corresponding vowels with the *short* mark (˘). The *ṣᵉghôl* is expressed either by *e* or by *ĕ.* In the Greek words the *short* vowels are not marked. The numbers used in citing Scripture texts have, where necessary, been altered so as to correspond with those of the English Bible. The printers have adopted the plan of a uniform numeral for *chapter* and *verse;* it will be understood that the *comma* marks a transition to a new *chapter* or *book,* and that it is placed *before* (not, as with Riehm, *after*) the transition. In order to lessen the number of parentheses in the text, I have transferred the major part of the Scripture references to the footnotes, even where, as in most cases, Riehm has placed them in the text. Except where the contrary is stated, the *page,* etc., references are to the originals of the works cited. The abbreviation *in loc. cit.* (in loco citato) means *in the work* (of the author in question) *already cited.* Riehm's style is on the whole terse and clear; but I have not hesitated in some instances to break

up sentences or transpose clauses, even when the taking of such liberties was not strictly necessary, and I have allowed myself occasionally to soften the harshness of what seemed an un-English expression by means of an apologetic *so to speak.* I have not been able to avoid a certain appearance of arbitrariness in the use of *capital* and *small initials,* particularly in the case of the words *kingdom* and *theocracy* and related words. I have tried to reserve the capital initial for the *ideal* as distinguished from the *historical* sense of these words; but in many instances the two senses manifestly tend to coincide. The words *holy land* are written with small initials, except where the expression seems to be used in its modern geographical sense. The word *Erkenntniss*—particularly the plural form—is notoriously a stumbling-block to translators from German. Probably I ought to have adopted Professor Davidson's suggestion to render it, wherever possible, by *truths;* but the plea of greater accuracy may perhaps be allowed to cover the occasional offence of *apprehensions* or even *cognitions.* The same excuse may be pled for *envisage, envisaging form* (veranschaulichen, Anschauungsform). The use of *content* for *Inhalt* does not now need an apology, but some readers may need to be reminded that German writers use the word *Moment* in the philosophical sense of a *stage* in a *process of thinking* or an *element* of a *mental conception,* and that the practice of English philosophical writers may now be said to have sanctioned its use in that

sense in our language. Would not a better plan, however, have been the use of the Latin form of the word (see p. 322)?

I trust the *Appendices* will be found useful. The Index of Scripture Citations has been constructed so as to enable the reader to discover without loss of time what Riehm may have to say on a particular passage.

In connection with the collection of material for the list of modern works on the Messianic Hope, I have to express my thanks to Mr. T. E. Sandeman, New College, Edinburgh, and to Mr. Kennedy, the librarian, as well as to Professor Davidson and the publishers. But my greatest thanks in this reference are due to Dr. P. Schmiedel, Jena, who furnished me with a very complete list of the works of importance—dealing either in part or whole with the subject, or some aspect of it—that have appeared since 1886. I have not attempted to include *Commentaries* in this list; but, if any exception to this rule had been conceded, it would have been made most willingly in favour of Mr. G. A. Smith's able homiletic work on Isaiah (London: Hodder & Stoughton), both volumes of which—particularly vol. ii. in the chapters dealing with the *Servant of the Lord*—deserve no less grateful recognition from the fact that Mr. Smith's views regarding the *Servant* do not altogether coincide with those here advocated.

East Wemyss, *February* 1891.

INTRODUCTION

BY PROFESSOR A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D.

THE translator and publishers have done a lasting service to students of the Old Testament by bringing out this new edition of Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy*. No work of the same compass could be named that contains so much that is instructive on the nature of prophecy in general, and particularly on the branch of it specially treated in the book. Some readers may not agree with Riehm in all the positions which he holds; but there is no one who will refuse to acknowledge the thoughtfulness, the fairness and candour, and the reverential spirit of the writer.

Perhaps the author has spent too much time in coming to terms with Hengstenberg and König on the nature of the prophetic inspiration. But the conclusion which he reaches is an important one, namely, that there is no evidence that the oracles of the canonical prophets were received in Vision, or in any condition to be strictly called ecstasy. Riehm

holds strongly that the progress of Revelation was organic, and in all cases, as he terms it, "psychologically mediated;" in other words, that essential steps towards any revelation that might be called new, or an advance on that already in existence, were the operation of the prophet's mind on truth already known, and the influence upon him of the circumstances around him. The theory of Vision has been thought necessary to account for the remarkable fact that all the prophets represent the consummation and perfect condition of the Kingdom of God as at hand, and bring it close up upon the back of the great events transacting in their own day—the early chapters of Isaiah, for example, placing it close behind the Assyrian devastations; and the later chapters, immediately on the back of the downfall of Babylon before Cyrus. Many writers describe this peculiarity of prophecy by the word *perspective*, and appear to think that they have explained it, whereas they have only called by another name the thing requiring explanation. Riehm appears to think that a sufficient explanation of the peculiarity is to be found in the earnest expectation of the prophets, in their ardent hopes of the speedy fulfilment of God's promises, and of the revelation of His glory to all flesh. This hope and fervent desire, acting on the imagination of the prophets, brought the consummation so vividly before them, that they represent it as at hand, and the issue of the great events taking place around them. There is an element of truth in

this view, though hardly enough to explain the phenomena. The important thing, however, in reading prophecy, is to recognise the facts, even if the explanation be obscure; and no fact is more certain or more necessary to be kept in view than this.

Another point which Riehm greatly insists upon is, that in interpreting any particular prophecy, the right question to put in the first instance is, What did the *prophet* mean? and what did he desire those to whom he spoke to understand? Such a question as, What did the Spirit mean? or, What did God mean, is not to be put at least in the first instance. Riehm recognises the propriety of the latter question in certain circumstances. The difference between the two questions (when they are not identical) is, that while the first relates to the particular part considered in itself, the second relates to the part considered as an element in a great whole. There is a difference between the comprehension of the workmen and that of the architect. While the individual workman, who polishes a foundation, or wreathes a pillar, may have perfect comprehension of the piece of work he is engaged upon, and be full of enthusiasm in the execution of it, he may not be able to see the place it will hold in the completed fabric, or the greater meaning which may accrue to it from the whole. Obviously this can be perceived only when the fabric is reared. The question, therefore, What did the Spirit mean? is one that can be answered only from the point of view of a completed revelation. But the historical

interpreter assumes that the revelation was progressive, and his endeavour is to throw himself back into the historical movement, and trace how truth after truth was reached by the prophets and people of Israel. This truth was no truth till it took form in the mind of the prophet, and hence the interpreter asks on each occasion, What did the prophet mean? When this question has been answered in each case down through the whole development, it may be profoundly instructive to look at any or each of the particulars in the light of the whole.

It is when Riehm reaches the positive part of his investigation that his work becomes most interesting — when, for example, he draws attention to the elements of a prophetic kind that lay in the very fundamental conceptions of the Old Testament religion, such a conception as that of a covenant of God with a people to be their God, that of a theocracy or kingdom of God upon the earth, or that of prophecy, men brought into the counsel of God and filled with His Spirit. These mere conceptions, and many others like them, were prophetic of a perfect future; they were so in a positive way, and they became even more so from the feeling of contradiction between the idea suggested and the small degree in which it had at any time been realised. Even the inherent imperfections of the Old Testament dispensation were prophetic of their own removal. Prophecy was to a large extent idealism, it transfigured institutions and history, and disengaged from them the religious ideal,

holding it up before men as a thing certain to be attained in the future, though only by being earnestly striven after. The organic connection of prophecy with history has been illustrated by Riehm with a wealth of examples exceeding anything hitherto done by others.

The term Messianic is used in a wider and a narrower sense. In the wider sense it is a description of all that relates to the consummation and perfection of the Kingdom of God, a use not altogether appropriate or exact. In the narrower sense it refers to a personage who is, not always, but often, a commanding figure in this perfect condition of the Kingdom. Many questions rise at this point for discussion, some of which Riehm touches only indirectly perhaps, such as the question whether there be in the Old Testament a Messianic hope in the narrower sense as a distinct thing, or whether it be not always a subordinate element in the larger hope of the perfection of the Kingdom of God. The question has its justification in the fact that the great personage spoken of is the glorified reflection sometimes of one officer in the Kingdom of God and sometimes of another; and that in the several prophets, one after another, he is the reflection of the officer that has the highest religious significance at the several periods when they wrote. During the monarchy he is the idealised theocratic king; after the Restoration, when the priest rose to eminence in the community, he is the glorified Priest. During

the exile he disappears, and his place is taken by an idea, which the powerful religious genius of the prophet of the exile (Isa. xl. seq.) has given body to, and made a person, the idea, namely, that the truth of the true God has been given to Israel, that this truth is incarnated in Israel, and thus has arisen a Being who is indestructible, an Israel which has existed all through the history of the outward Israel, and will continue to exist; a vital heart in Israel which will yet send its living pulses even to Israel's extremities, and through Israel will become the life and light of the Gentiles. How profoundly Christian, if not strictly Messianic, this idea is, need not be said. At all times the Saviour is Jehovah, and if the great personage whom we call the Messiah play any part in salvation, whatever his *rôle* be, king or priest, it is the divine in him that is the saving power. The theocratic king is the representative of Jehovah, the true King and Saviour. What must he be to truly represent Him, and what will he be when he does so? Nothing less than the manifestation of Jehovah Himself in all His saving attributes (Isa. ix., xi.). This point is perhaps hardly elaborated in Riehm with sufficient fulness.

Finally, in the last section of his work, devoted to the question of Fulfilment, and distinguished by candour and thoughtfulness, Riehm insists much on the distinction between Prophecy and Fulfilment. The two must be kept sedulously apart. Prophecy is what the prophet, in his age and circumstances and

dispensation, meant; Fulfilment is the form in which his great religious conceptions will gain validity in other ages, in different circumstances, and under another dispensation. Certain elements, therefore, of the relative, the circumstantial, and the dispensational must be stripped away and not expected to go into fulfilment. Every prophet speaks of the perfection of the Kingdom of God, looks for it, and constructs an ideal of it. We are still looking for it. The fundamental conceptions in these constructions are always the same,—the presence of God with men, righteousness, peace, and the like,—but the fabrics reared by different prophets differ. They differ because each prophet seeing the perfect future issue out of the movements and conditions of his own present time constructs his ideal of the new world out of the materials lying around him: the state of his people; the condition of the heathen world in his day; such facts as that the Kingdom of God had a form as a state, and that the centre of Jehovah's rule was Zion. These relative elements are not called figurative, they are essential parts of the prophet's conceptions. But if we inquire how far the prophet's ideal of the perfect Kingdom of God may be expected to be realised, obviously these relative elements in it will have to be stripped away, and fulfilment looked for only to the essential religious conceptions. It would be far from the truth, however, to fancy that the relative and concrete form in which the prophet embodies his eternal truths has lost all significance to us. It is of the utmost signifi-

cance; for, in the first place, it brings home to us better than anything else the *reality* of the religion and the religious life in the Old Testament times, for obviously if the Prophecies had had *us* in view they would have taken another form; and secondly, the concrete embodiment of the prophetic truth helps us to realise the truth; we see the situation, and can transport ourselves into it, and live over again the life of men in former days. There is little in the Old Testament of which it can be said that it is antiquated.

The translator appears to have done his work well. His rendering is vigorous and readable. Perhaps he is a little too partial to the use of the technical terms of philosophy. There is no doubt that the language which "wives and wabsters" speak is capable of expressing everything which any reasonable man can desire to say to his fellows.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION, ... 1

FIRST PART.

THE ORIGIN OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY, ... 11

1. (*a*) Its Origin in Revelation, ... 11
   (*b*) The Mode of Revealed Communication to the Prophets, 19
   (*c*) The Organico-Genetic Connection of Prophecy with the Root-Ideas of Old Testament Religion, . . . 59
2. (*a*) The Idea of the Covenant, ... 66
   (*b*) The Idea of the Kingdom of God, ... 88
   (*c*) The Idea of the Theocratic Kingship, . . . 101

SECOND PART.

THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY—ITS ADAPTATION TO THE TIMES, ... 124

THE FACT AND THE REASONS OF ITS MANIFOLD FORM, . . 125

1. Its Times-Colouring, ... 133
   (*a*) Resulting from its Destination, ... 133
   (*b*) And its Origin, in particular, the Limits of the Prophetic Prospect, ... 142
   (*c*) Proof-References, ... 153
2. The yet deeper Influence of the circumstances of the Relative Times upon the Content of Messianic Prophecy, . 175
   (*a*) Their Influence upon the Unfolding of the Separate Germs of Messianic Apprehension, . . . 176
   Proved in the case of the Prophecy regarding the Messias, ... 179
   And of other Elements in Messianic Prophecy, . 194
   (*b*) The Parallelism between the course of the History of the Kingdom of God and the Development of Messianic Prophecy, ... 203

THIRD PART.

PAGE

THE RELATION OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY TO NEW TESTAMENT FULFILMENT, ... 217

1. Its Times-borrowed Features, ... 219
2. Its specifically Old Testament Features, ... 228
3. The Old Testament Envisaging Forms still adhering to all Messianic Prophecies, in particular, ... 234
   (*a*) Jerusalem, the City of God, ... 235
   (*b*) Israel's Central Position in the Kingdom of God, . 238
4. The Measure of Apprehension of God's Saving Purpose exhibited by Messianic Prophecy, ... 271
   (*a*) In relation to the Final State of the People and Kingdom of God, ... 272
   (*b*) In relation to the Mediation of Salvation, in particular the Person of the Messias, ... 278
   (*c*) In relation to the Messianic Work of Salvation, . 283
   (*d*) In relation to the Conditions and Historical Course of the Realisation of Salvation, ... 288
5. The ultimate Reference to Christ of all Messianic Prophecy in the Scheme of Historical Revelation and Salvation, 296
6. The Coincidence of Prophecy and Fulfilment in Individual Concrete-Historical Features, ... 310
7. The Fulfilment of Messianic Prophecy in the Church and Kingdom of Christ, ... 313

CONCLUDING REMARKS, ... 318

ADDITIONS BY TRANSLATOR.

APPENDICES.

A. Notes, ... 325
B. Index to Scripture Passages cited by Riehm, and to his other references to Ancient Literature, ... 330
C. List of Modern Works referred to by Riehm, ... 341
D. Recent Literature on Messianic Prophecy, or on the growth of the Messianic idea in Jewish History, ... 345

INTRODUCTION.

IN this work we use the phrase *Messianic prophecy* in its wider sense, understanding by it all the Old Testament promises of the final accomplishment of the Kingdom of God, and the consequent glorification of His people. Messianic prophecy in the narrower sense (the prophecy, viz., of an ideal theocratic king of the house of David, with whose appearance is associated the inauguration of the last time) cannot be made an object of separate investigation, because its growth is intimately connected with that of the more universal promise. It is, moreover, axiomatic with us as Christian theologians that the *entire body* of Old Testament promise, relating to the *last times*, finds its fulfilment in and through Christ; and when we appropriate for the phrase *Messianic prophecy* the wider sense that has now become common, it is only our way of expressing this fundamental conviction.

No special proof is needed, that what we thus describe as axiomatic is repeatedly attested in the most emphatic way by Christ and the apostles. Every one remembers the sayings of Christ: that the Scriptures of the Old Covenant testify of Him (John 5. 39); that

His sufferings and death, His resurrection and glorification, were preannounced in the law of Moses, in the prophets, and the psalms (Luke 24. 44 ff.); that what was *written* of Him *must* be fulfilled (Matt. 26. 54, Luke 22. 37); that the Scripture could not be broken (John 10. 35), and others of like import. Every one knows how the apostles invariably start with the proof that what God had foretold by the mouth of all His prophets had been fulfilled in the appearance, the career, the work of Christ—in the salvation He brought, in the Kingdom He founded; how, in particular, even Paul attests that God had "promised afore" by His prophets the gospel of His Son (Rom. 1. 2), and that all the promises of God are "yea and amen" in Christ (2 Cor. 1. 20). The minuter study of the views of the New Testament writers has tended to set only in clearer relief the fundamental importance which they attach to the conviction that the New Covenant is the accomplishment of the Old, and the fulfilment of its prophecies. It has shown, in particular, that even in its most developed phases the apostolic doctrine of the person and work of Christ finds its basis and starting-point in the belief that Jesus is the promised Messias of the Old Covenant.[1]

Even the Old Testament, moreover, is not behindhand in attesting the justification of this assumption. It attests it in so far as Messianic prophecy points

[1] Cp. in regard to the Johannine Christology my remarks in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1864, pp. 552 ff., and A. H. Franke, *Das Alte Testament bei Johannes*, 1885, pp. 166 ff.

expressly beyond the Old Covenant itself. For it not only announces the extension of the original purely Israelitish theocracy to a universal Kingdom of God, embracing all peoples; it indicates also with perfect definiteness that in the last days there will occur a thorough *inward* transformation of the existing theocracy, and a substantial alteration in the character of the covenant-fellowship between God and His people. *Then* there will be no place either for Levitical priest or official prophet, for Israel will be a nation of priests (Isa. 61. 6), and will be furnished with the gift of prophecy (Joel 2. 28 f.); all without distinction shall know the LORD and be taught of Him, so that none shall need instruction from another (Jer. 31. 34, Isa. 54. 13). The law shall not be written on tables of stone, but on the heart (Jer. 31. 33). The ark of the covenant will be forgotten, for the gracious presence of God with His people will no longer be a mere dwelling in the inner shrine of the temple. Rather shall all Jerusalem be called the "Throne of the LORD." It will be the place of His dwelling and His revelation. There the tribes of Israel will be assembled about their God; thither also the Gentiles will come up (Jer. 3. 17). The whole economy of the Covenant will be different. God will make a new covenant with His people, different from the covenant made with their fathers at Sinai (Jer. 31. 31 ff.). And all this will result from one grand and final deed of salvation—a full revelation of grace, which shall at once crown all previous revelations and put them in

the shade (Jer. 16. 14 f., 23. 7 f., Isa. 43. 16 ff.).—Who can deny that the goal, which Old Testament prophecy has in view, while it lies thus obviously beyond the limits of the Old Covenant, is none other than that which, in accordance with the New Testament, and history, and the personal experience of every true Christian, *is* attained, and is ever *more* attained, in and through Christ? For surely all such transcendent visions in the Old Testament point ultimately to a *Last Time*, in which for all the individual members of the unlimited Theocracy fellowship with God shall be perfect through the complete remission of sins and the universal outpouring of the Spirit.

The general proposition, that all the promises of God are yea and amen in Christ, must, however, be more accurately defined. The relation of Old Testament prophecy to New Testament fulfilment requires a minuter investigation. The time is past when a dogmatising exegesis could find the whole sense of New Testament assurance expressed in the Old Testament—only with less distinctness, and under cover of various emblems and types. The right and the duty of a strictly historical consideration and exposition of the Old Testament have gained a wider recognition. At the same time, and partly as the result of the Christology of HENGSTENBERG, the conviction from which we started has asserted itself with fresh force and in ever-widening circles as the inalienable possession of Christian faith. How does the strictly historical exposition of the Old Testament harmonise with this

conviction? Does it not look as if it undermined it, or at least considerably loosened the bond which, in the correspondence of prophecy with fulfilment, connects the Old Testament with the New? Modern theological science has to seek a new and satisfying answer to the question: In what way and in what measure did Old Testament prophecy *promise afore* (Rom. 1. 2) the gospel of God concerning His Son. This is undoubtedly an important task. For, according to what we have noted above, we are concerned to know whether and in what way Christ's consciousness of the relation of His vocation and work to the whole course of previous revelation can lay claim to *historical* justification and foundation. What insight may we have into the wonderful ways the wisdom of God has used in the education of men—of Israel in particular; ways, whose goal was Jesus Christ? On our answer to this question must depend in no small degree the measure of importance which we Christians may attach to Old Testament Scripture.

These pages aim at contributing to the solution of this problem. They do not contain an exhaustive treatment of Messianic prophecy. But they may perhaps claim to be a consecutive exposition of the three points which are of first importance in a synopsis of the subject.

To arrive at a true view of the relation of prophecy to fulfilment, one must start on the right road in ascertaining the *contents* of prophecy. This is not done by those whose main or only question is: What

did *God* or the *Spirit of God* intend to say in a prophecy, and who do not trouble themselves to ascertain the sense which the *prophets* attached to their *own* utterances, and in which they wished them to be understood by their contemporaries.[1] How, let us ask, is the sense which God or the Spirit of God intended in a prophecy sought and found? The answer is: We must look backwards, we must see the prophecy in the light that falls upon it from the point of view of the fulfilment. We are far from condemning wholesale this way of regarding Old Testament prophecy. In the purely practical and religious use of the Old Testament it is both right and necessary. For here the only essential point is to ascertain what prophecy says *to us*, and there is no offence to science if by means of our fuller New Testament assurance the buds of Old Testament promise are made to unfold themselves, or if by the same means the bare outline is converted into the clearly coloured picture. Even in scientific investi-

[1] Cp. Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, 2nd ed. iii. 2, p. 204: "The two questions must be carefully distinguished—what sense the prophets attached to their own utterances, and what God intended in these utterances. . . . On our present method the answer to the former question cannot be found, and *is not for us of great importance.*" In Hengstenberg's case this disregard of history results from his general view of prophecy. If the prophet's only business is to describe the picture which God has shown him in a state of ecstasy, and if the prophecy is contained only in this picture which—even though the prophet's own spirit was allowed to participate in its production—is yet substantially only the work of the Spirit of God, it cannot, of course, matter much whether and in what degree the prophet himself apprehended its significance, or what sense he attached to his own words.

gation this method has its place. In our present inquiry it is specially requisite, for our task is to determine the *purport* of individual utterances considered as *members of the entire developing body* of Old Testament prophecy. It certainly cannot be denied that it is only when we survey the whole body of Old Testament prophecy, with its many members, and in the progress of its historical development, from the point of view of the accomplishment of God's saving purpose in Christ, that the teleological significance of each individual prophecy can be fully recognised. But to ascertain the direction in which the contents of a prophecy relate themselves to its fulfilment, while it determines an important *relation* of the prophecy, gives no sufficient explanation of the prophecy itself. *For what can be recognised only in the time of fulfilment is precisely what is not contained in the prophecy itself.* A definition of the contents of a prophecy can include only the sense—albeit the *full* sense—in which at the time of its utterance the prophecy could be understood, and was necessarily understood.

From this sense must not be omitted what the prophet apprehended only in vague presentiment, without clear consciousness. This presentiment belongs to the contents of the prophecy—of course, however, *only in the vagueness* characteristic of all mere presentiment. On the other hand, to represent the fuller meanings that in the light of New Testament fulfilment came to be attached to a prophecy, in virtue of its ultimate reference to Christ in the Divinely-laid

plan of historical revelation, as its proper, true, and Divinely-intended sense, only breeds confusion; but if we are determined to retain this mode of expression, we must at least take care not to reckon the *Divinely-intended sense* as part of the actual *contents* of the prophecy, when it is our express object to determine the relation of the prophecy to its fulfilment. To refuse to distinguish clearly at the outset between prophecy and fulfilment, by putting into the former a meaning that can be recognised only by means of the latter, is to renounce all pretension to an exact knowledge of the state of the case. It means that we *interpret prophecy more or less in reference to fulfilment*, and tend thus to reduce our problem to the absurd one of determining the relation of prophecy to a fulfilment, in whose light it has already been interpreted. Much of the dissension existing between those who lay the main stress on the agreement between prophecy and fulfilment, and those who emphasise principally the historical character of prophecy, rests solely upon the fact that the former have missed the proper statement of the question, and have not kept in view with sufficient clearness and precision the only relevant problem. Hence: The significance which a prophecy receives only when it is looked at in the light thrown back upon it by its fulfilment, and the sense in which the prophets themselves understood their utterances, and intended them to be understood by their contemporaries, — in other words, the *historical sense* of

prophecy,—must be clearly distinguished. Only the latter is in the proper sense of the word the *content* of the prophecy. Hence *it* only can be taken into account when we have to determine the relation of the prophecy, as such, to the fulfilment. It is therefore not only not of small, but of the very greatest importance. For apart from it a scientific solution of our problem is axiomatically impossible.[1]

[1] It is a pleasing sign of an incipient mutual understanding between opposite tendencies of thought in the Old Testament field, that the correctness of the above propositions has been substantially acknowledged by a theologian of the school of Hengstenberg—viz. Dr. KÜPER, in his work, entitled *Das Prophetenthum des Alten Bundes* (Leipzig 1870, pp. 89 ff.). Instead, however, of distinguishing between the contents of prophecy and its goal in the historical revelation of grace (or its significance as a member of the total organic series of Old Testament prophecies), he prefers to distinguish between the *historical* sense, to be ascertained by exegesis, and the contents of the prophecy, assigning to the latter the above-mentioned ultimate reference or *goal*. Such a procedure serves rather the interest of his peculiar view of prophecy as something objectively given by the Spirit of God—and therefore *to be distinguished as much as possible from the subjective consciousness of the prophet*—than that of clear scientific knowledge. A clear and precise meaning can be attached to the expression *contents* only when it is made "wholly synonymous" with the *historical sense*. Küper is, of course, right in saying that the prophets are conscious of announcing secrets which reach beyond the limits of their own comprehension (although the passages cited by him, Jer. 33. 3, Dan. 9. 22, Zech. 4, Hab. 2. 1 ff., imply only that they did not know and understand *before* revelation what was given them *by* revelation). Just as frequently a pregnant poetic utterance may contain, besides what the poet himself was fully conscious of expressing, possibilities of meaning which he has grasped only in the vagueness of feeling, so even more frequently the oracle of a prophet encloses a treasure, one part of whose worth he himself clearly knows, while of the other part he has only a vague presentiment, whose content may nevertheless in time emerge gradually into clear consciousness. This must be so especially in visions, where reflection, working upon a mental representation firmly retained by the memory, elaborates the inner connections and the

In what sense the prophets themselves intended their utterances to be understood by their contemporaries must be ascertained by an exegesis that

significance of the individual features into reasoned clearness. Yet the same is true of every idea of rich content; after it has been grasped as a whole, there comes the slow process of clearly apprehending one by one all its individual moments. Now: *To the contents of a prophecy belong undoubtedly not only the sense, to which the prophet has given clearly conscious expression, but also that higher and deeper meaning*, which, so far as the prophet is concerned, *lurks still in the shadowy light of mere presentiment. This latter must, however, be reckoned to the contents of the prophecy only in the indefiniteness, characteristic of mere presentiment, in which it is present to the prophet's mind*, or in which, in proportion to their receptiveness, it may be present to the minds of his contemporaries. *Thus reckoned, it belongs also to the historical sense.*

The *Object*, however (in the absolute sense), of revelation and prophecy—*i.e.* the *Decree* of *Jehovah*—is so great and high, that it transcends even the *presentiment* of the prophet, and remains the object of new and future revelations in the sense that the contents of these latter are not a mere external addition to the earlier revelations, but are organically developed from them (see below). But that portion of this *absolute object*, which lies beyond the reach of even the prophet's presentiment, cannot be reckoned as part of the contents of his prophecy. And thus a distinction cannot be made between the historical sense and the contents of a prophecy. In an explanatory sentence (p. 72 of his work, *Die alttestamentliche Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreiches*, Vienna 1882) von Orelli has acknowledged the distinction we have demanded between the contents of a prophecy and its goal of fulfilment in Christ through a process of historical revelation: "We must take," he says, "our standing ground *entirely* within the time of the origin of these (prophetic) utterances." In the same place he allows to the historical fulfilment a "merely regulative influence" in the treatment of prophecy. That he should see in our above propositions "a dualistic partition" of the contents of prophecy is due entirely to misapprehension (cp. my criticism in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1883, pp. 803 ff.). Even Fried. Ed. König,—*Der Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testaments*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1882,—in spite of his rigidly supranaturalistic view of the revelations made to the prophets, has acknowledged the necessity of the distinction we have demanded. (Vol. 2, pp. 385, 389.)

is at once grammatical, critical, and psychological. Unanimously as the necessity of such exegesis is as a matter of principle acknowledged in our time by the representatives of the most widely differing standpoints, a certain anxious timidity not unfrequently prevents the theologian, who is a believer in revelation, from making a candid acknowledgment of its results in particular instances. This is apt to be specially the case in the treatment of those passages which have passed current for a considerable time in the Church as Messianic prophecies, but to which the exegesis of to-day denies that character. But it happens also in the discussion of the question whether this or that really Messianic passage is or is not to be referred directly to the person of the Messias; and, in general, whenever an attempt is made to fix precisely the prophetic content of such passages, the same spirit is often enough observable. Even though the difference between Old and New Testament apprehension is in principle allowed, a delicacy is felt in making the admission in any particular case, that so *little* New Testament assurance[1] should be contained in passages which we have been accustomed to cite as principal witnesses for the intimate connection between Old Testament prophecy and New Testament fulfilment.—But let us see to it that this timidity does not carry with it a tendency to depreciate the germ-like begin-

[1] [Here, as in other places, for the German *Heilserkenntnis* (apprehension of salvation)—a sufficient but not strictly accurate equivalent. —Tr.]

nings of Divine revelation, and to assume the unbecoming position of critics of the Divine educative wisdom. It is our duty to get rid entirely of the fancy that we do justice to Divine revelation and prophecy in the Old Testament only when we find our New Testament assurance expressed in them. The principal reason of our timidity is that, in the desire to see the connection between the Old and the New Testament, we confine our view too narrowly to individual passages. He who in a temple that is an acknowledged architectural masterpiece does not survey the structure as a whole, may easily look for more beauty and perfection of form in the details than they by themselves really possess. The spectator, however, who admires the whole building, need have no scruple in acknowledging the imperfections, in their isolated character, of details, which make the temple great and splendid only by their coördination and harmonious articulation. One who, in like manner, has gained an insight *into* and a view *of* the whole Old Testament economy, and has, as a consequence, attained a full and clear conviction that the Old Covenant, as a whole, has been planned with a view to a future fulfilment in the New, and that the whole trend of religious development in the Old Testament is towards Christianity, will, in the exegesis of all particular Messianic passages, without scruple recognise only that measure of knowledge of God's saving purpose which, when examined according to the rules of a strictly historical method of exegesis, they are found really to contain.

It is not our intention in the present work to begin by fixing exegetically the precise import of particular prophecies. We presuppose the results of exegesis. Our problem, as that of those who have gained these results, is as follows:—We wish to understand the essence and character of Messianic prophecy in the Old Testament, viewed in its totality as a *historical phenomenon.* We propose to do this by investigating the relation which the contents of particular prophecies bear to the prevailing religious standpoint of Israel, to the course of development pursued by Old Testament religion, to the historical events, conditions, and circumstances of the times of utterance, and to the subjective peculiarities of the prophets who uttered them. We must examine likewise the mutual relations of these prophecies to one another. It is only when we have gained in this way a knowledge of the historical character of Messianic prophecy that we can by comparison of our results with New Testament fulfilment obtain a satisfactory answer to our main question. — In accordance with this plan our first business is to present, and—so far as may appear necessary in view of the labours of others—to justify, the results of our investigation of the *historical character* of Messianic prophecy.

FIRST PART.

THE ORIGIN OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

TO attain a knowledge of the essence and character of an historical phenomenon, it is of first importance that we go back to the *beginnings of its growth.* The first question, therefore, with which we are concerned, relates to the origin of Messianic prophecy. What is this origin? How did Israel—how, in particular, did the prophets arrive at the idea of a Messias? To be content simply to say, as a rigid and soulless supernaturalism says: "By the revelation of God," or: "By the enlightening efficacy of the Divine Spirit," is, of course, to express a truth, but it is no answer to our question. *It is to express a truth:* for, of course, it is true of Messianic prophecy, as of the prophetic word in general, that it originates in the revelation of God, mediated by the effectual work of the Spirit. *We also* are persuaded that an historical understanding of Old Testament prophecy is impossible apart from a recognition of the reality of the Divine revelations imparted to the prophets.

Any person who regards the prophets simply as men of remarkable wisdom and piety, who sought to impart to the masses their peculiar religious, ethical, and philosophical convictions, and to gain acceptance for

these in practical life, particularly in the sphere of politics, who, in order to this, employed, among other expedients, that of announcing hopes and fears, derived partly from their faith in a righteous Providence and partly from their patriotism and political sagacity,—any one who, in maintaining such a view, deliberately ignores the idea of an *extraordinary operation of the Spirit of God* upon the mind of the prophets, must be content to forego an understanding of the inmost essence of the entire historical phenomenon of Old Testament prophecy. For it is an undeniable fact—a fact attested once and again on every page of the prophetic writings—that the prophets themselves were most clearly and certainly conscious of announcing, not their own thoughts, but the thoughts of God revealed to them,—not their own words, but the word of God laid upon their hearts and put into their mouths. It is precisely this point that they emphasise when they distinguish themselves from false prophets. They claim that they are sent by God, and have received a definite commission to discover some secret of His counsel; while the false prophets appear without Divine commission, and speak, not what Jehovah has spoken to them, rather only the vision of their own heart (*chăzōn libbām y^edhabbēru lo' mippi Yah^eveh*).[1] They prophesy the deceit of their own heart; they "use their tongues, and say: He saith" (Jer. 23. 31).

[1] [For the benefit of the ordinary reader we print here, as elsewhere, the Hebrew, or, as the case may be, Greek words in Roman letters.—Tr.]

They are, in short — *n'bhi'ē millibbām* (prophets (speaking) from their own heart)—cp. Jer. 23. esp. vv. 16, 18, 21, 22, 26, 28, 31, and Ezek. 13. esp. vv. 2, 3, 6, 7, 17. This distinction between the true and the false prophet rests undoubtedly, further, on the clear consciousness of the former, that as the faithful servant of his God he keeps ever in view—in all that he utters and prophesies—the one object of giving effect to the will of God in the State and among the people, while the false prophets deliberately renounce any such task, and pander selfishly to the likings and passions of the people. As the principles and aims observable in a prophet's ministry become to others the standard of judgment as to whether or not he has really been called to his office by Jehovah, and as His servant been made the worthy trustee of real revelations; so, as regards the prophet himself, his subjective certainty of his Divine calling is conditioned by the testimony of his conscience, that in his preaching and prophesying he is not seeking his own ends.[1] But even this method of marking the difference between false and true prophets is possible only when the latter are most clearly conscious that their prophetic testimony as a whole does not proceed "from their own heart," and, so far from being the product of

[1] In his criticism of the above propositions König (in *loc. cit.* ii. p. 229, note) has put his own construction upon them, as if the meaning were that the prophet's certainty of having received Divine revelations was grounded *solely*, or at least *principally*, upon the fact of his good conscience. His inclination to deny to the latter all significance in this relation is the result of his rigid supernaturalism.

their own reflection, wishes, hopes or fears, is in reality something *given* them by God. Every reader of the prophetic writings knows that not only does almost every new clause commence with *Wayʿhi dhʿbhar Yahʿveh ʾelai* (*and the word of the Lord came unto me*) *Koh'āmar Yahʿveh* (*thus saith the Lord*), or the like, if it is not closed with a *nʿum Yahʿveh* (*oracle of the Lord*), but also that quite commonly the personal number is changed, and the address is delivered directly in the name of God. The prophets have, moreover, not only the confident certainty that what they announce in the name of God will assuredly come to pass, but the prophetic word itself is in their view a power of God. It is a word which, so to speak, *accomplishes its contents of itself*, and that just as infallibly as the law of nature, whose operation it may formally include, proves itself no mere empty phrase, but a really present effective force in the physical system (cp. for example Jer. 1. 10, 23. 28 f., Is. 55. 10 f.). And the consciousness that they have received a definite commission from Jehovah exercises upon the prophets themselves a force so overmastering that all their own inner resistance to it cannot be reckoned of account (cp. Amos 3. 8 and esp. Jer. 20. 7–9). On the other hand, just here lies the power which enables them to face every danger with indomitable courage, and to fulfil their commission even when all the forces of king, princes, people, priests and a whole pack of false prophets are arrayed against them (cp. Jer. 1. 17 ff., 20. 10 ff.). Many other passages might be cited in

proof of the clear and indestructible conviction of the prophets that they announce only what God Himself has communicated to them to be announced.[1] Those who desire to lay firm historical hold of the phenomenon of Old Testament prophecy must do justice to this element in the prophetic consciousness. This can be done only by conceding to it *objective validity*—surely no difficult concession; for one has only to think of such an event as the annihilation of Sennacherib's host by the "sword not of a mighty man" (Isa. 31. 8) to see how much there is in the coincidence of events with prophecies, uttered too long before them to be considered the result of ordinary human foresight, to convince even the most gainsaying that the vivid overmastering conviction of his own inspiration

[1] Jer. 28 is, among other passages, very instructive. In ver. 6 Jeremiah distinguishes with great definiteness between the word of ill-omen he has to announce by commission of God and the false prophecy of Hananiah, which yet is in harmony with the patriotic wish of his own heart. Clearly as he knows Hananiah to be a false prophet, he is content in the first instance to refer the matter of the genuineness or falsity of his prophecy to the future decision of history, and gives no immediate answer even to Hananiah's violent confirmation of his false prophecy, but "goes his way" (ver. 11). Only after the word of God has come to him afresh, does he oppose—with emphasis superior even to Hananiah's—his own prophecy of evil to the latter's deceptive promise of deliverance, tells him to his face that he is a false prophet, and announces his death in the course of the year in well-deserved punishment for his offence (Deut. 18. 20 ff.). Not less instructive is 2 Sam. 7. 1 ff., where Nathan at first regards David's intention of building a temple as pleasing to God, and pronounces accordingly, but is afterwards instructed by a special oracle in the night to restrain him. Cp. Oehler, art. "Weissagung" in Herzog's *Realencyklopädie*, xvii. pp. 627 ff.; H. Schultz, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, vol. i. p. 167, vol. ii. pp. 44 f.—in the 2nd edition, pp. 220 ff. The claims which the prophets themselves make for the

entertained by the prophet is not without historical foundation.[1] We therefore cordially admit the proposition that the prophets received every oracle by Divine revelation. But that this admission carries us only a very little way towards an answer to our question as to the origin of Messianic prophecy, becomes obvious the moment we remark upon *the way in which, according to the prophets themselves, the Divine communications were, as a rule, made to them.* On this point, however, we confine ourselves—in conformity with our special aim in this treatise—to a rigidly relevant line of remark, and are content to refer the reader to the exhaustive discussions of BERTHEAU, and, in particular, of OEHLER.[2] In agreement with these theologians we must at once declare ourselves against the view

reality of their special communion with God in revelation have been vindicated with the greatest success by Friedr. Ed. König in the work already referred to (esp. in vol. ii. pp. 161 ff.). His view of the subject, however, suffers much from its literalism (see below).

[1] Even BERN. DUHM, in his work, *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwickelungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion* (Bonn 1875), must make such an admission as that: "for fully the third of a century Isaiah was witness of the most perplexing combinations of the political sky, and on all events—except those of quite subordinate interest—pronounced a judgment that was never fallacious. Surely a great result!" But when he adds: "The simple means which produced this result—the source from which the prophet's political wisdom flowed—was nothing more than the *belief that Jehovah was directing the affairs of all nations into the channel of His purpose for His own people*," the consideration, that many have held this belief without being able to give an infallible judgment on coming events, might have convinced him that his own explanation of the "great result" is wholly insufficient.

[2] Cp. BERTHEAU, "Die alttestamentliche Weissagung von Israels Reichsherrlichkeit in seinem Lande," ii., in the *Jahrbb. für deutsche Theologie*, 1859, vol. iv. pp. 603 ff. OEHLER, art. "Weissagung" in

that finds the essential characteristic of prophetic inspiration in the state of *ecstasy*, and regards the *vision* as the usual medium of the revelation made to the prophet. The principal advocate of this theory is HENGSTENBERG. The view, however, which he gives in the second edition of his *Christology*—a view greatly modified from that of the first edition [1]—is rather in the direction of saying that, when the prophets received a Divine revelation or spoke in the Spirit, they were by no means in a condition of unconsciousness (this as against Montanism [2]). On the contrary, the words of STEINBECK might be cited as an appropriate description of their state: "The inspired man not only *feels* more keenly, he *thinks* also more acutely and more clearly." Still their condition at such times was "one most distinctly marked off from what is normal and ordinary." They were in a state of ecstasy. In other words, the sum-total of their normal faculties—sensible perception and desire, secular thought, and their intellectual consciousness as a whole—was *abnormally* repressed by a sudden overmastering operation of the Spirit of God upon their spirit; while, on the other hand, their inner perceptions were aroused to such extraordinary acuteness that they *immediately* saw or heard what God designed to reveal to them. While

loc. cit. pp. 629 ff., and *Theologie des Alten Testamentes*, ii. § 205 ff. Also THOLUCK, *Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*, pp. 49 ff.

[1] Cp. Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, iii. 2, pp. 158–217.

[2] [The generic name for the *ecstatic* view of prophecy, so called from *Montanus* of Phrygia, who flourished in the middle of the second century. See Kurtz's *Church History*, § 37, also *Lux Mundi*, p. 343.—TR.]

they were in this state, outward perception was entirely suspended; the intellectual consciousness was overpowered by the spiritual, the *noûs* by the *pneûma*, yet in such a way as that the ordinary thinking powers, so far from ceasing to operate, were rather stimulated to follow the flight of the loftier and special faculty of *intellectual intuition*,[1] always, however, at the distance which became their condition as at once essential inferiors and faithful servants of the faculty of inner perception. An inspiration, thus constituted, involves the *visionary* character of all prophetic apprehensions. In the state of ecstasy the prophets see visions, and in their utterances they describe only what they see in the Spirit. Hence the rapid movement of prophetic discourse from one object to another corresponds to the swift succession of visions before the spiritual eye.—The proofs of this view, in the presentation of which we have confined ourselves almost entirely to Hengstenberg's own words,[2] are various. They have been sought, partly in the familiar examples of the *lowest degree of prophetic inspiration* (Balaam, Saul, etc.), partly in *isolated* instances of states of ecstasy which prophets and apostles have experienced, partly in certain words and phrases which have remained in use since the earliest days of prophecy, when naturally the lowest was also the prevalent form of inspiration. Emphasis has been laid upon these last in spite of the fact that

[1] See Appendix A, Note I.

[2] Cp. in *loc. cit.* pp. 169, 173, 174, 176, 179, 181, 184.

in view of the development of prophecy it is impossible to attach to them their literal etymological sense, and that words originally descriptive of isolated and extraordinary states of consciousness have as a matter of fact come to be used to denote the ordinary mode of revelation (*mar'āh, ro'im, chōzim, chāzōn* and the like). The chief defect of the view is, however, just that it fails to distinguish with sufficient clearness between the different degrees and kinds of prophetic inspiration, and does not consequently do justice to the facts. It has been well remarked that the prophecies of Isa. chaps. 40–66, and in general most of the prophecies in the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Micah, and others, neither admit of being described as *visions seen in ecstasy*, nor yet betray on the part of the prophets a spiritual state "most distinctly marked off from what is normal and ordinary." "These discourses (*i.e.* those in Isaiah, etc.) do not attest any *sudden* possession of the prophet by some overmastering force, — showing itself in movements and convulsions of the body,—they attest rather a *continuous* Divine operation, a subjective activity heightened through communion with God, *which admits of the freest use of human gifts, and the most perfect command of the prophet's original powers and capacities.*"[1] Even Hengstenberg allows that the eschatological discourses of Christ, in particular those in Matt. chaps. 24 and 25, are *generically* identical with the Messianic utterances of the prophets. Common

[1] Cp. Bertheau in *loc. cit.* pp. 607 and 610.

to both is the characteristic peculiarity of oracular speech—that, viz., of comprehending, in a single glance and a continuous chain of sequence, events widely separated from one another in point of time. He grants further that the eschatological discourses are "*by no means* visionary in character, inasmuch as at no point in the experience of Christ can we detect the presence of the ecstatic state of mind" (in *loc. cit.* p. 193). How then can it be asserted that the essentially similar utterances of the prophets must have had their origin in Divine communications, involving an ecstatic condition in the prophet, and mediated by visions? What on this view would be the mental history of those prophets for whom prophecy was not an event of now and then, but rather a life vocation, fulfilled continuously throughout a long series of years (cp. *e.g.* Jer. 25. 3)? Would not the mental soundness of an Isaiah or a Jeremiah have suffered considerably from the constant recurrence of those *abnormal* conditions into which, according to this theory, the sudden and overmastering operation of the Divine Spirit must have thrown them![1] Over

[1] The whole argument of Hengstenberg is manifestly dominated by a dogmatic interest. His aim is to find the strongest possible guarantee for the reality of Divine revelation, and he would accomplish his purpose by removing the psychological condition of the prophets as far as possible from the sphere of ordinary experience. But are signs and wonders requisite to guarantee the belief that the word of God is in reality *His* word? Granted that signs and wonders can serve both to awaken faith and to support weak faith, surely faith ought to be able to dispense with them (John 4. 48) without any diminution of certainty (cp. article "Zeichen und Wunder" in my *Dictionary of Biblical Antiquities*). Signs and wonders, moreover,

against the proposition that ecstasy is the dominant characteristic of prophetic inspiration, we may, in view of the hints contained in the Old Testament on the

cannot in a single instance give us the proof we desire. For visions are not in themselves a sufficient pledge of the supernatural origin of an alleged revelation. Are there not visions which prove only a morbid state of mind in the seer?—Besides, Hengstenberg's argument is not free from self-contradiction. In the *first* edition of his *Christology* he carried his theory to its legitimate consequences, barely escaping the extreme of Montanistic error. The alterations in the *second* edition are improvements, in so far as they are more in accordance with the facts, but they are—at least to a considerable extent—out of harmony with the view that governs his main conclusions. In particular, the allegation, p. 194, "that the prophets deal as a rule with *general truths*, not with facts in their empirical isolation," hardly agrees with his main position, though it may well promote the tendency to resolve the distinctively historical features of Old Testament prophecy into bare illustrations. In KÜPER'S treatment of the subject (in *loc. cit.* pp. 47–57) I remark an absence of lucidity. He also claims for all prophecy an "ecstatic foundation," but would have us understand this phrase in a "wider sense." But to the question: In *what sense?* he supplies only the negative answer: that extraordinary *physical* convulsions are not as a rule involved in prophetic inspiration. On the other hand, he allows that, with prophets like Isaiah and Jeremiah, besides the "extraordinary moods and states of inspired *possession*," there intervene calmer states "in which prophecy exhibits rather the equable character of a higher stage of spiritual life in Israel." That even in this case their prophetic activity "presupposes not only an inner certainty of a Divine commission, but also a state of spiritual elevation resulting from special experiences of Divine power and operations of the Spirit," and that "special illumination intervened so often as it might be required by the prophets in the fulfilment of their vocation," is by us at least expressly allowed. But it is quite another question whether these "special experiences" and "special illuminations" are or are not of such a kind that we are at liberty to describe them as *ecstatic states*, and to speak of an *ecstatic foundation* in all prophecy. It would appear that Küper believes himself unable to dispense with these modes of expression, if he is to "conserve to prophecy its properly objective contents as over against the active and subjective functions of consciousness," but that he comes to no clear understanding with himself

subject of prophecy,—in view, in particular, of the prophetic writings themselves,—confidently lay down the following thesis: The *lower* the grade of prophecy, the more does the *ecstatic* condition become the *normal* one for inspiration; whereas in the *higher* and *riper* stages it occurs but seldom—principally in the initial revelation, which constitutes the prophet's call.[1]

That thus real instances of ecstasy occur in the sphere of genuine prophecy, cannot obviously be denied. The fact that they do so is clearly attested both by the Old and the New Testaments. In the *lowest* kind of ecstasy the seer loses self-control: self-consciousness, and self-determination—the two essential elements of personality—are suspended. What one, so inspired, does, he does not by his own will, rather under the compulsion of the possessing Spirit, of Whom he is the unconscious, will-less instrument. Thus also when the state of ecstasy is past, he has no definite remembrance of what he has experienced. Examples of such ecstatic conditions lie ready to hand in what is told of Saul and his messengers (1 Sam. 19. 20 ff.) and in the New Testament *tongues* (1 Cor. 14). It

as to what precisely they imply.—Against the view of Hengstenberg, cp. also König in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 6 ff., 53 ff., 83 ff. What the latter remarks, ii. pp. 139 f., against my arguments, as above, results partly from such obvious misunderstanding, that it has seemed to me sufficient to secure my meaning against such unexpected misapprehension by some slight verbal alterations; but partly also his remarks are based upon the fanciful conception—to be explained below—which pervades his whole book, that an "internal" event is an "immanent" one, and that the "supernatural" can be certainly guaranteed to men only by means of *external sensible perception* (see below).

[1] Cp. Duhm in *loc. cit.* p. 86.

goes without saying that ecstasies of this kind—however deep their significance and blessed their consequence may be to the religious life of those who experience them (cp. 1 Cor. 14. 18)—are not adapted to the purpose of communicating a revelation; they lie on *this*-side of prophecy proper. Hence the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. 14) expressly distinguishes between the *tongue-gifted*, who speak only "with the Spirit," and those who speak "with the understanding also," and places the superiority of the latter to the former precisely in the fact that in their case the understanding is exercised, and they are therefore in a position to edify the community by their discourse.[1] But besides ecstatic conditions of this kind there are others, which are marked by no such obliteration of the prophet's personality. His subjectivity is shaded, but not paralysed; his own will can assert itself even in presence of the Spirit; the continuity of clear self-consciousness is not interrupted. What is extraordinary in such a condition is that the connexion between the spiritual life and the external world is for the time broken, the relation of reciprocity subsisting between self-consciousness and the sensible world is suspended, and the spirit is wholly engrossed in the active perception of an object which does not

[1] It must be remembered, moreover, that speaking with tongues did not by any means *always* involve an unconscious condition. Witness the case, repeatedly referred to by the apostle, in which the tongue-gifted possessed a parallel gift of interpretation. We must, in short, suppose the line which separates the lower and the higher stages of ecstasy to be in many conceivable ways a *vanishing* one.

belong to the sensible world. This concentration of all the spiritual faculties upon a single act of inner perception is an effect of the overmastering Spirit, and may be so intensified as to include in the common activity—by the power of phantasy—even the sense-faculties of *sight* and *hearing*. In this condition, therefore, while the prophet enjoys clear self-consciousness (barring only the obliteration of actual external objects), he sees visions and hears voices.[1] In such cases there remains, after the cessation of the ecstasy, a more or less clear remembrance of what has been seen or heard. The analogy between these ecstatic conditions and dreams, which even the ancients[2] remarked, and which appears in the frequent dream-revelations of the Old Testament, is a perfectly exact one. Only in the dream the temporary suspension of correspondence between the spiritual life and the sensible world is induced by the physical condition of sleep, while in the state of ecstasy it is an effect of the Spirit—being the direct result of the concentration of the inner or spiritual energies upon the perception of an object not actually present in the sensible world.

Now it must be admitted that not only the prophets of the Old Testament, but even the apostles,[3] were frequently at the moment of revelation in an ecstasy of this kind, especially in the cases in which God Him-

[1] Morbid phenomena of this kind are what we call *hallucinations*.

[2] Cp. *e.g.* Cicero, *de divinatione*, i. 50 (113), 51 (117), 57 (129), 30 (63).

[3] Cp. *e.g.* Acts 10. 9 ff., 2 Cor. 12. 1 ff.

self in some sensible form was brought before the spiritual eye, or the circumstances and fortunes of the people of God were represented under certain external symbols. True, many of the visions narrated in the later prophetic writings may have been but the fanciful dress and veil of thought; true, in other instances (as, *e.g.*, Ezek. chaps. 1 and 40 ff.) the prophets may have used pictorial representation as a means of adding illustrative detail to the vision seen in the Spirit; still it remains an incontestable fact that even in the bloom of prophecy ecstatic conditions and visions were reckoned among the actual experiences of the prophets in the fulfilment of their vocation.

Just as certain, however, is it that at this time vision and ecstasy were not the *normal* vehicle of revelation. It is only of *special individual* revelations that the prophets say that they received them by means of visions. Isaiah, for example, tells of only one such experience—that, viz., which was connected with his consecration and call to the prophetic office (Isa. 6), and only in Isa. 8. 11 f., if even there, is there any hint of its recurrence. On the contrary, the expressions most commonly used to designate the act of revelation, as well as the essential character of the prophetic discourses and oracles, point to *another* method of Divine communication. Such phrases as the following may be cited: "The word of the Lord came unto me" (Jer. 1. 4); "The Lord said unto me" (*id.* 7); "I have heard of the Lord (or the like)"

(Isa. 21. 10, 28. 22, Jer. 49. 14, Ezek. 3. 17, Hab. 3. 2; *n^eum Yah^eveh, i.e.* secret confidential communication from the Lord (literally, *what is whispered*—an appropriate description of the hollow, deadened tones of a voice from the world of mystery; cp. the roots *nāham* and *hamāh*), and the like. These are the most common phrases, and they must form our point of departure in any attempt we make to determine precisely the mode of prophetic revelation. On the other hand, it cannot be right to emphasise in this connection such comparatively unusual words as *chāzōn* and *chazuth*, etc., words manifestly appropriate directly only to *visions*, and applied only incidentally to prophecy in general.

We see thus that the usual method of prophetic revelation is to be understood as a *hearing of the word of God.* This is expressly allowed even by König (in *loc. cit.* ii. p. 8 f.) when he distinguishes between *showing* and *speaking*, or the *vision* and the *hearing of the Divine word*, as the two methods of prophetic revelation, and points to the former as the less frequent (cp. ii. p. 388). But to a much greater degree than Hengstenberg, or indeed any of the theologians who lay stress upon the supernatural character of revelation, he insists that both events (*i.e.* the *seeing* and the *hearing*) are extraordinary, lying wholly beyond the circle of familiar and ordinary experience. According to him the *vision* of the prophet is a veritable *seeing; i.e.* he actually sees with the *bodily eye*, which is specially equipped

for the purpose, appearances and events which, so far as he is concerned, God allows to transgress the limits of their proper sphere in the invisible world. Similarly his *hearing* of the word of God, is a veritable *hearing:* his bodily ears are mysteriously opened to hear the Divine speech *literally and articulately sounding towards him from the other world.*[1] What therefore, according to tradition, happened only on *rare* and *extraordinary occasions*—viz. that the spoken word of God became

[1] As regards the *seeing*, he states his view thus (ii. pp. 100 f.): "My assertion is: that only a veritable *seeing* of phenomena, which God allows to meet their vision from beyond the limits of the visible world, could give the prophets the kind of certainty with which their visions inspired them, and that this seeing must be that of persons who are awake, and have their outer eyes open, who are in possession, not only of their self-consciousness, but of their self-control." How much in earnest he is over the idea that visions are "objectively real events for the bodily eye," such expressions as the following show (ii. pp. 126 f.). "Even in the case of the vision of the Macedonian in the *Hórama dia tês nuktós* (Acts 16. 9), unless it is to be considered a mere dream or hallucination such as is common to men—one of the stock products of the factory of the imagination—there must have been a crystallising of ether-particles, forming to the outer eye of the waking Paul the image of a Macedonian;" ii. p. 132, "In order to become visible, heavenly things (according to ii. p. 79, 'God and the angels') have often assumed a certain abnormal condensation." This condensation, he explains in the same passage, varies in degree. Sometimes the heavenly form can be seen with actual "eyes of flesh," at other times the eyes must be specially opened; ii. p. 256, "God Himself, as well as the spirits in His service, have for the purpose of self-manifestation assumed such condensations (or concentrations) of their usual mode of being (*morphê*), that they became *visible* to the prophets;" cp. further, ii. p. 211. On the *hearing*, cp. such as the following: i. p. 82, "From all this we see that the call of the prophet was *external* and *sensible*, not exposed therefore, like mere human reflection, to the risk of illusion;" i. p. 87, "The question of importance is whether the Divine word (Gen 12. 1) came really once upon a time sounding from the other world into the ear of Abraham;" ii. p. 359, "If, according to all that we have said above, the subject-matter of a *word-revelation*

outwardly audible, whether as a call from heaven or from some earthly habitation (Ex. 19. 19, 20. 22, Deut. 4. 12 f. and ver. 36, cp. Gen. 21. 17, 22. 15, 1 Sam. 3. 1 ff., 1 Kings 19. 12 ff.), and what in the Gospel history occurs only at *isolated moments of crisis* (Matt. 3. 17, 17. 5, John 12. 28)—constituted, according to König, the normal mode of revelation to the prophets.[1] The prophet on this view stood to God in precisely the same relation as a pupil, who learns by question and answer, or repetition by heart, stands to his teacher; or as a servant, who mechanically remembers some verbal commission, and after a longer or shorter interval accurately conveys it to the destined ear, stands to his master.[2] Still König does not regard all that the prophet spoke or wrote as the immediate word of God in the sense he has defined, but only those sentences, which they themselves *expressly* designate as sayings of God, which they have heard. He distinguishes therefore between the words of God that have come directly from Him without any sort of psychological medium, and the

could have been presented to the prophet only by means of an actual voice reaching his ear from a sphere normally transcendent and imperceptible, we must further assume that these communications were, in form, articulate indications of the Divine will." Cp. also ii. pp. 210 and 155 ff.

[1] In the later Jewish theology the voice descending from heaven (cp. Dan. 4. 31)—the so-called *bath kōl*—is notoriously reckoned a kind of *lesser* equivalent for the revelations of prophecy and the Holy Spirit. Cp. on this Ferd. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, Leipzig 1880, pp. 184, 187 ff.

[2] Cp. König in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 209, 219, 220.

additions of the prophets from the store of their own knowledge or of common revelation, and attempts in particular instances of passages from the prophets to separate the two elements from each other.[1] He cannot, however, conceal from himself the difficulties of such an undertaking: not only is the passage in the prophetic text from the Divine Speaker to the human prophet in many cases almost entirely imperceptible, but the utterances that are directly and exclusively assigned to God are, as regards their correspondence with the individuality and historical horizon and standpoint of the prophet, entirely of a piece with the alleged "additions." König endeavours to set aside this difficulty by adopting from the *Inspiration*-dogma of the elder Protestantism the idea of an *accommodation* on the part of the revealing God to the individuality and "historical horizon" of the prophet, and by making the freest possible use of the idea of a *pedagogic adaptation* of the Divine speech to the spiritual, and, in particular, the ethico-religious standpoint of his time.[2] With this is connected, further, his admission, that the Divine message did not necessarily come to the prophet in the exact form of words and sentences in which he might deliver

[1] König in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 220, 270–278, 356–359: While he recognises the "additions" and "embellishments" of the prophetic writings, as—if not "directly Divine," yet—"Divine human," he would have the detailed statements of the historical books of the Old Testament—among others, those concerning the prophets—examined according to the tests applied to the prophets' own testimony, and with reference to the question whether or not in the tradition human chaff has been mixed with the genuine Divine grain. See Appendix A, Note II.

[2] König in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 209, 218 f., 307, 312 f., 348, 356, 363 ff., 397.

it; but that, on the contrary, we must recognise the exercise on the part of the prophet of a relative freedom in such merely formal respects.[1] The futility of such a make-shift will, we should suppose, be obvious to most. It cannot serve to conceal the essential incongruity of König's rigidly obscurantist view of the mode of Divine revelation to the actual facts of the case as presented in the prophetic writings. The hypothesis of an accommodation of Divine revelation to the individuality of the prophet and the mental capacity of his hearers, is not inconsistent with the doctrine of the *Inspiration of Scripture by the Holy Spirit*, and so long as it was only, or mainly, a question of how to explain observed differences of style in the prophetic writings, and other matters relating only to the form of presentation (*i.e.* up to the latter half of last century), one could at least hope to find in it a sufficient guide through the perplexities of our subject. But to require us to believe in a literal Divine voice sounding in the ears of the prophet is surely a romantic caricature.[2] And if we consider the far-reaching consequences of the praiseworthy candour with which König allows the stamp of the prophet's individuality and historical limitations to adhere to the word of God as communicated to him, and remember the free use it necessarily led him to make of what is at best a precarious hypothesis, it cannot surprise us that he himself should have been staggered and confused by the intricacies of his own reasoning. Of such a result we actually find some

[1] König in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 361, 364. [2] See Appendix A, Note III.

traces towards the end of his work (see below). His own idea, of course, was that his hypothesis was necessary to justify the claims the prophets made for themselves. Closer investigation, however, tends to the discovery that no such necessity lies in the prophets' own account of their inspiration, but only in König's literalistic interpretation of their words, and that this, again, is chiefly the consequence of the gross sensationalism involved in the idea that dominates his argument. We mean the idea that only an act of external perception can form the basis of a certainty as to the objective reality of an event that shall exclude every doubt and possibility of illusion, and that therefore a "truly objective kind of Divine communication" can be only one that is *external* and *sensible*—capable, *i.e.*, of being perceived through the bodily senses of sight and hearing.[1] We refrain from investigating more

[1] König in *loc. cit.* i. p. 82, "From all this we see that the call of the prophet was *external* and *sensible*, not exposed therefore, like mere human reflection, to the risk of illusion;" i. p. 100, "What then, shall we say, must have happened in the spiritual experience of the prophet to produce an *indubitably* "recognisable" "call of God"? i. p. 3, "If the prophets were conscious of some specially qualifying coöperation of the Divine Spirit with theirs as the only Divine factor of their prophetic knowledge, a discrimination on their part between their own subjectivity and the Divine thoughts would not have been reliable, or even possible;" ii. p. 101, "Otherwise (*i.e.* apart from bodily eyesight) they would have had no certainty that they were not following after what they have not seen (Ezek. 13. 3), what had come from their own heart, what they had themselves imagined;" ii. p. 125, "No other 'inner sense' is discoverable, which should prove itself different from *thinking*, from *phantasy*. If *thinking* and *phantasy* had been employed by the prophets as the means of perception, they could not have been convinced of the objective reality of what they saw;" ii. p. 160, "It is my fixed conviction that the moment we

closely the *Sensationalistic*[1] view of knowledge involved in such an opinion, the more so, that König does not seek to found his view upon abstract principles. We simply set over against it the contrary axiom expressing our own conviction: *that God who is spirit is able to reveal and communicate Himself to the human spirit immediately — without*, i.e., *the mediation of external sense-perception, and that this revelation is of a "truly objective kind," carrying with it a certainty that excludes all doubt.* On the other hand, we cannot escape the task of examining more minutely the personal testimony of the prophets. How are we to conceive their *hearing of the word of God?* What are we to say of the supports which König found in this and other like phrases for his own view?

Of first importance here is the point which we have already emphasised (pp. 16 f.), and which is treated at length by König as the third principal utterance of the prophets regarding their own inspiration (ii. pp. 161–366)—we mean the clear and certain consciousness of genuine prophets that the Divine word which they announce does not originate *millibbām* (from their own heart) like the alleged oracles of the false prophets, but has been really communicated to them by God.

reject the transcendental standpoint and the truly objective method of Divine revelation, the endeavour to uphold the Divine authorship (hence also the Divine subject-matter) of the prophetic deliverances becomes vain;" ii. p. 181, "An 'inner act of consciousness' is too precarious a foundation for such an edifice as the prophetic certainty."

[1] [The closest possible equivalent for the German *sensualistisch*, though the latter is perhaps hardly used in the same technical sense.—Tr.]

So far we can heartily agree with König in saying that, according to the testimony of the prophets themselves, they received their communications "from without inwards:"[1] they do not proceed from within the prophet himself, but from God, whom the prophet knows as a Person, distinct *from*, and not dwelling *in* himself — standing in "truly objective reality" over against his own *ego*, yet actually conversing with him. We must beware, however, of resting on this consciousness of the prophets a heavier weight of inference than it can bear. König makes this mistake when he infers from it a denial on the part of the prophets "that their prophetic cognitions were worked into form in the human soul, or took shape under the ordinary processes of judgment and inference, or the influence of human feelings and motives" (in *loc. cit.* ii. p. 174). For the expression *millibbām*, as used of the false prophets, and the consciousness of the genuine prophets that *their* word of prophecy does not originate *millibbām*, relate only — be it said, in the first place — to the *source* of the oracle, not to the mode of its communication to the prophet. In reference to the latter point, it leaves just as much room for mediation to the transaction that belongs to the inner sphere and domain of the spirit as to that which belongs to the outer world of sense. It does not make the slightest difference that in the

[1] Of course, however, "without" here is not to be made synonymous with the external world of sense-perception. Yet only on the basis of such a confusion of terms would it be possible to assert that a "reception from without" *must* be one mediated by external sense-perception.

former case the medium is purely psychological, while in the latter it is external sense-perception; whence, secondly, it appears that such expressions as *millibbam* and *lō' millibbēnu*[1] refer throughout essentially only to the *contents* of the Divine message, not to its outfit in form and mode of presentation. In the end, even König himself is constrained to admit so much, for he says (in *loc. cit.* ii. p. 362): "If we base our conclusions solely upon the testimony of the prophets themselves, we cannot affirm that the phrase 'not from our own heart' signifies: Our heart takes no part in the formal shaping of the report we give of the revelation. On the contrary, the prophets intend, in what we have called their third principal utterance, only to uphold the Divine originality and integrity of their message as against adversaries. The phrase is neither designed nor fitted to prove anything contrary to the proposition that the receivers of revelation have woven Divine threads after a Divine pattern into a Divine-human web." And this admission does not—as might be supposed from the last words—relate merely to the prophets' own additions, but also to what is expressly designated as the Divine speech; for, according to ii. p. 361, it cannot be concluded from the personal testimony of the prophets "that the Divine word-revelation must have been formulated *in all its words and sentences* precisely as it is reproduced in the deliverances of the prophets."

In the various other expressions used to denote the

[1] *Not from our own heart.*

Divine revelation made to the prophets, there lies, as in the *lō' millibbĕnu*, already noticed, in various forms but always with the same import, the general conception that the Divine word is received as something proceeding from God and presented by Him—something, therefore, received "from without inwards;" and, as the revealing God as a Person stands over against the person of the prophet, it is only natural that the expressions most commonly used to describe the relation between God and the prophet should be borrowed *from the customary form of immediate intercourse between person and person.* It is by speaking and hearing that human persons interchange thought and spiritual experience in general. Similarly, God *speaks* and the prophet *hears.* It ought, however, to be understood, as a matter of course, that things similarly described are not necessarily similar to each other. It cannot be assumed without proof that the intercourse of God with a prophet is quite the same in kind with the intercourse of men among themselves. In particular, it cannot be assumed that this intercourse is mediated by external sense-perception. Every Israelite knew that God was not a Person who belonged to the external, sensible world, and that, therefore, when He was spoken of in human terms the phrases could not be understood in quite the ordinary sense.[1]

[1] The following remark of König's is mildly characterised as very ill-considered (ii. p. 179, note 3): "How can Jeremiah's frequent phrase, 'And Jehovah said unto me' (1. 7, etc.), be made to bear any other meaning than, *e.g.*, 'Hanameel said unto me' (32. 8)? To give different senses to the same words remains for ever an exegetical

The prophets, therefore, could employ the common phrases of human intercourse to denote the intercourse between God and the prophets, without intending to say that the Divine speech was addressed to them in an externally audible way. The essential thing they wish to express is, *that there has been a communication from a Person to a person;* and this by no means excludes the possibility that the communication is one only *internally* audible, taking place in the domain of the spirit, and not in the sensible world. Similarly, a non-sensible mode of communication is by no means excluded by the fact that, in some individual instances, the prophets declare that they have heard the Divine word "with their ears" (Isa. 5. 9, 22. 14, Ezek. 3. 10, 9. 1. 5, 40. 4, 44. 5), although König urges the contrary with special vehemence (in *loc. cit.* pp. 158, 179, note 3, 181). For even if in these cases the phrase, "with mine ears," were to be taken with absolute literalness, we should not be justified in inferring a general rule from isolated cases,[1] in which sensible perception may have had part in the reception of the revelation. And if the word "hear" is, by a trope undeniably legitimate, used in a sense not strictly literal, it is hard to see why "to hear with the ears" might not be intended in a sense other than literal.

impossibility." Moreover, he contradicts himself by regarding, *e.g.*, the expression, "Jehovah said unto me," in Isa. 36. 10, 2 Kings 18. 25, as not implying Divine speech in the proper sense (cp. ii. pp. 239 ff., in general, pp. 239-261).

[1] It is a violent and unwarranted exaggeration on the part of König (ii. p. 181) to affirm that the prophets were "constantly" saying, "We have heard it with the ears."

It is, in fact, nothing more than a way of adding impressive emphasis to the simple "hear" (cp. Ps. 44. 1).[1]

But, besides all this, there is no lack of definite indications that, by their use of the expressions borrowed from intercourse between human persons, the prophets did not intend to express an audible speech of God, or a hearing with the bodily ear. God must *awaken* (*hēʿir 'ōzĕn*=arouse the ear), or *open* (*pāthach 'oz*—), or *discover-to* (*gālāh 'oz*—) (Isa. 50. 4 f.; 1 Sam. 9. 15) the ear of His servant, so that he hear the Divine word. What else can this mean than that God opens and sets in activity the spiritual ear, or the faculty of inner perception adapted to supersensible communications?[2] Further, besides the usual *dibber 'el* (to speak *to*), there is employed, to denote the speech

[1] König cannot mean to deny that the bodily ears are not meant in every instance of the use of the phrase in question (cp. Isa. 6. 10). He does not, we should think, propose to understand literally the phrases in which Ezekiel describes the *opening of his mouth* and the *eating of the book-roll* (Ezek. 3. 1–3). Why then insist that, in such phrases as *lifting up the eyes* or *hearing with the ears*, the bodily eyes and ears must be meant (König, ii. pp. 39 f., 75 f.)?

[2] König (in *loc. cit.* ii. p. 179, note 3) declares such an interpretation impossible, and insists on understanding even these expressions only of a special equipment and quickening of the bodily sense of hearing. So correspondingly (and here he is partly right) with the *opening* or *uncovering of the eyes*. But surely *bodily hearing* is just as little meant in the passages he quotes as in Job 33. 16, 36. 15, and Isa. 48. 8. The expression *gālāh 'ōzĕn* is indeed sometimes used of communication by means of ordinary sensible speech (1 Sam. 20. 2, also vv. 12 and 13, 22. 8. 17, Ruth 4. 4); but even in these passages *'ōzĕn* does not directly signify the *bodily ear*. On the contrary, the expression is borrowed from the language of revelation (cp. 2 Sam. 7. 27, 1 Chron. 17. 25), and signifies the *revelation of something hitherto concealed*. The mere fact of the constant use of the singular number

of God or an angel to the prophet, the phrase *dibber bᵉ* (to speak *in*),[1] which does not, of course, mean *to speak* IN *a person*, but is at the same time not perfectly synonymous with the word for simple *address*. It is a phrase of more express import, being employed only of a revealed communication, and denoting that what is communicated is, as it were, *spoken* INTO the person addressed.[2] I am not inclined to lay any special stress upon the fact that, in Ezek. 3. 10, the command, "All my words receive into thine heart," *pre*cedes "and hear with thine ears" (cp. 44. 5, and, for the contrary order, 40. 4), or that, according to Jer. 20. 9, the word of God is in the *heart* of the prophet, consuming him like fire if he would forbear to speak, though it certainly warns us against an exaggerated literalism in the interpretation of the familiar *lo' millibbēnu*. But by the fact that they employ other phrases than *hearing*, or *hearing with the ears*, to denote their inward reception of the Divine word, or, generally, its com-

in the expressions in question suffices to indicate that the *bodily* ears are *not* meant. In passages like Ps. 40. 6, where, besides the higher and principal meaning, there is meant to be at least an accompanying reference to what is literal, the plural form, *'oznayim* is used.

[1] Cp. Hos. 1. 2, Hab. 2. 1, Zech. 1. 9. 13. 14, 2. 2. 7, 4. 1. 4. 5, 5. 5. 10, 6. 4, Num. 12. 6. 8, 2 Sam. 23. 2.

[2] König (in *loc. cit.* ii. p. 178 ff.) has mistaken the special significance of the phrase. It is never used of the speech of one human being to another (1 Sam. 25. 39 cannot, in spite of Gesenius, be translated "he spoke *to* Abigail," but "he spoke *about* Abigail" (*i.e.* with a view to secure her in marriage); cp. Ps. 119. 46). For this the only properly corresponding phrase is *dibber bᵉ 'oznē* (to speak in the ears of). We have not adduced the passages Num. 12. 2 and 1 Kings 22. 28 in note 1 (above), because it is doubtful whether *dibber bᵉ* does not there mean *to speak by* or *through*.

munication, the prophets indicate clearly how far it is from their intention to represent the word of God as sensibly sounding in their ears. Thus, *e.g.*, the word of God is described as *meat* or as a *written roll*, which the prophet must eat (Jer. 15. 16, Ezek. 2. 8, 3. 2 f.); or it is *put into the mouth* of the prophet (Num. 23. 5. 16, Deut. 18. 18, Jer. 1. 9); or the prophet *sees* it and God *shows* it to him (Jer. 38. 21, Ezek. 11. 25, Hab. 2. 1 f., Isa. 2. 1, Am. 1. 1). The very fact that the phrase, *And it came to pass that the word of Jehovah came unto*, etc.—a phrase by no means common as descriptive of audible speech between human persons [1]—is that most commonly and with preference employed by the prophets to denote a Divine communication, can be explained satisfactorily only by the supposition that the Divine speech, unlike human speech, is not heard with the outer ears. Finally, we have express testimony that it is the *Spirit of God* who not only effects the *hithnabbe'* (the prophetic gift), and in particular qualifies the prophet to speak in the name of Jehovah, and to announce His counsel and will,[2] but is also the communicating medium of the Divine word. Thus in Isa. 30. 1 f. the intimation proceeding from Jehovah, or from His *mouth* (ver. 2), is likewise thought of as proceeding from His *Spirit;* in Ezek. 11. 5, the proposition, *He* (*Jehovah*) *spake to me*, is annexed to the preceding, *The Spirit of Jehovah fell upon me;* Zech.

[1] Num. 11. 25 ff., 1 Sam. 10. 6. 10, 19. 20 ff., Joel 2. 28 f.

[2] Isa. 48. 16, 59. 21, 61. 1, Micah 3. 8, 1 Chron. 12. 18, 2 Chron. 15.1 f., 20. 14 ff., 24. 20.

7. 12 is an express statement of the Spirit's mediation, *The words which Jehovah Sabaoth hath sent through* (*b*^{e}) *His Spirit by means of* (*b*^{e}*yadh*) *the former prophets;* cp. also Neh. 9. 30, *and Thou gavest them witness through thy Spirit by means of Thy prophets.* Further, the words of the false prophet Zedekiah, *Which way went the Spirit of Jehovah from me to speak unto thee?* (1 Kings 22. 24, 2 Chron. 18. 23) show that the *speech of Jehovah* and the *speech of the Spirit of Jehovah* are synonymous expressions; and, finally, it appears from 2 Sam. 23. 2 f., whether we render the *bi* of ver. 2 by *to* me or by *through* me, and whether in the former case we understand a revelation made directly to David himself or one mediated by Nathan, that the communication of the Divine word to David was mediated by the Spirit of Jehovah.[1]

We have thus good ground for describing the ordinary mode of revelation as one that implies, on the side of God, a pecular *inward speech* [*Einsprache*= literally, a *speaking into*, as if what the prophet spoke *out* had first to be conveyed *in*.—Tr.] *mediated by His Spirit*, and on the side of the prophet a corresponding psychical operation of *inward hearing*.[2]

[1] König (in *loc. cit.* i. pp. 104–114, 141–144) allows to the Spirit of God only a preparatory work—that of qualifying the prophet to receive the Divine message, and urging him to prophetic utterance. In Zech. 7. 12 and Neh. 9. 30, he would have us understand an "objective Spirit of God," "a second Divine Being" alongside of Jehovah, an "objective Middle-Being between Jehovah and the prophet," who is the medium of bringing the word, which Jehovah Himself speaks, *to the ear* (!) of the prophet.

[2] We prefer these phrases to the common description employed, *e.g.*,

This inward speech, however, and the correlative hearing, we shall require, as a rule, to conceive of as simply *a certainty as to the will and counsel of God wrought immediately in the spirit of the prophet by the Spirit of God.*[1] It is a certainty that has not come to him by way of reflection, or, in general, by any usual mode of original activity. The prophets are clearly conscious that it is something given them by God, that they are receiving His commands and decrees just as really as a trusted servant hears from the lips of his master what is that master's will and intention. The stage of the mysterious transaction is not indeed the sensible world, but neither is it the *mere subjectivity* of the prophet. We must insist rather that there is an actual converse of the living personal God with the person of the prophet.[2] On the other hand, this in-

by OEHLER (art. "Weissagung," p. 636, *Theologie des Alten Testamentes*, ii. pp. 187 ff.), according to which the psychical activity of the prophet is represented as an *inward* or *immediate intuition*—a phrase with which conceptions alien to the true state of the case readily associate themselves. See, in particular, the misleading remarks of VON ORELLI (in *loc. cit.* p. 39) on the *scenographic* character of prophecy. If an "intuition" mean only that "the subject knows the object as immediately given and not produced by his own activity," no objection can, of course, be made to the use of the word. Neither is it to be denied that prophetic knowledge—specially if it relate to the future course of history—has in many respects an "intuitive character," inasmuch as it is rather the prophet's faculty of imagination than his understanding or reason that is employed in the reception of the Divine communication, and, consequently, his peculiar knowledge emerges to consciousness in the form of intuition. (See below, and cp. *Studien u. Kritiken*, Jahrg. 1883, pp. 805 f.)

[1] Cp. H. SCHULTZ in *loc. cit.* i. pp. 173 f., ii. pp. 46 f. In the 2nd ed. pp. 227 f., 232 f.

[2] What right has KÖNIG (in *loc. cit.* i. pp. 78, 82, 88, ii. p. 155) to presuppose the impossibility of such *inward* assurance or of such

wardly assuring operation of the Spirit of God upon the spirit of the prophet cannot take place arbitrarily. There must be law and method. Man's spiritual experience is governed by a Divinely-established order, which is neither suspended nor disturbed by the operation of the Spirit of God. Even though this operation be of *transcendent origin*, it is accomplished in a manner conformable to the established order, and yet is not on that account, as König contends (*e.g.* ii. 139 f., 224 *et passim*), reduced to a merely "immanent" process.[1] In other words: Although the inner assurance of God's will and counsel does not *originate* in the sphere of the subjective spiritual life, it comes to pass only in conformity with the laws proper to that sphere—albeit the operation of these laws appears only in an act of *reception*. It is therefore *psychologically mediated*.[2] It must not be supposed, moreover,

spiritual intercourse between God and an inhabitant of the visible world, or to deny, in particular, that a valid certainty as to his call may reach the prophet at a particular time and place?

[1] Cp. Rothe's detailed treatment of the relation of miracle to the order of nature (*Zur Dogmatik*, pp. 87 ff.).

[2] That these propositions cannot be attested by express citations from the prophets, forms no valid ground of objection to them. König's conception of an accommodation on the part of God to the individuality of the prophet is, as he himself allows (ii. p. 364), equally destitute of this kind of confirmation. It also is of the nature of a *retrospective theory*, based, indeed, on a proper appreciation of the *facts of prophetic discourse* as known to us, still manifestly going beyond the utterances of the prophets, and even beyond the explicit contents of the prophetic consciousness as a whole. And, in place of the idea of an *external accommodation*, it is in my judgment more credible and more in conformity with the facts to say that God has condescended to exercise His revealing grace in a way that perfectly corresponds with the laws of man's spiritual life.

that the coöperation of the prophet's original powers involved in this act of reception is by any means necessarily of an unusual kind, transcending the ordinary processes of the spiritual life after the manner of an ecstasy or any similar state. The object of the inner prophetic certainty will indeed not unfrequently emerge to the prophet's consciousness in the plastic form of an intuition. This will be the case in proportion as the prophet's powers of imagination—what we may call his *phantasy*—are roused to activity. And if there be an excessive concentration of the spiritual powers upon this intuition, the stage of ecstasy, accompanied by the ecstatic visions of an excited phantasy, may be reached. But this is not by any means what is usual or ordinary, nor does the transaction as a whole, mysterious as it is in itself, stand apart as a perfectly isolated phenomenon. Two *analogies* from the sphere of *religious experience* may be of special service in bringing it nearer our comprehension. The one is the way in which to this day every *living* conviction of religious faith, every Christian truth that is recognised as carrying its own certainty with it, is arrived at. Even such a conviction is assuredly not the product of reflection,—however much reflection may be exercised in connexion with it, —nor does it proceed purely from a man's own subjectivity in general. It is attained rather in every single instance through a revealing operation of God; it is impossible apart from a certainty as to saving truth wrought immediately by the Spirit of God—

apart, in fact, from the so-called *testimonium internum Spiritus Sancti.* "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." So said the Lord to Peter when he uttered the confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16. 17, cp. also 11. 25, and 1 John 2. 27). Now, it is undoubtedly to an essentially similar mode of revelation that we must refer the main portion of the contents of the prophetic writings. This is specially true of those passages where the only concern of the prophet is to obtain due recognition for the will of God as known from the law, to bring to mind the fundamental truths of the Old Testament creed, to apply them to certain definite circumstances, to develop extensively and intensively recognised religious axioms or the like. *To this domain belongs a very large portion of the contents of Messianic prophecy.* The analogy between the mode of revelation to the prophets and the inward assurance of saving truth effected by the Spirit, is the more perfect from the fact that in both cases (if we may anticipate a later inference of our argument) the operation of the Spirit is indissolubly connected with the correlative operation of the Divine word, attested orally or in writing. It is well known how frequently a prophet's discourse connects itself with and grows out of that of his predecessors. It might, of course, be objected that this line of remark fails to do justice to the *specific* character of prophetic discourse. It might be urged, in particular, that the Old Testament teacher of wisdom must be to a like

extent credited with a Spirit-wrought certainty as to religious and ethical truth. He also, it might be said, wishes to communicate to others and make practically valid the convictions thus attained; and yet nowhere within the compass of the didactic poetry of the Old Testament do we find the authors sounding the peculiar note of prophecy. They do not enforce their precepts, exhortations, and warnings as a *word spoken by God Himself* to their hearers or readers. They have not that full consciousness of speaking in the name and commission of Jehovah, which would warrant in their text that transition to the direct speech of God which is so frequent in the prophetic writings.[1] This very obvious difference, however, arises from the fact that the prophet is conscious of a special *call* addressed to him, in virtue of which he has been constituted an organ of Jehovah, an interpreter of the Divine will, a bearer of the continuous revelation of God to His people, and has been *above others* entrusted by God with a *definite mission* to his contemporaries, whereas the teacher of wisdom is conscious only of the general call—the property of every man who finds himself in possession of a truth—not to keep his treasure to himself, but to make it available for others also. The latter does not, like the prophet, feel impelled to utterance of his doctrines and precepts by

[1] The perception of this difference has given rise to the well-known Rabbinical doctrine that the prophetic writings were inspired by the *Ruach Hannᵉbhu'āh* (the Spirit of Prophecy), whereas the *Hagiographa* resulted only from the general and commoner inspiration of the *Ruach Hakkodhesh* (the Spirit of Holiness).

the conviction that the existing state of affairs demands from him the immediate fulfilment of a perfectly definite duty of his calling, laid upon him by God. Naturally also the word of the wise man will be to a much greater extent than that of the prophet a product of original reflection; it will emerge to his own consciousness as such, and as the fruit of his life-experience; and this, even although the truth he utters receives the seal of the Spirit of God. It is different with the prophet. To him, in his consciousness of his special Divine mission, the truth, of which the Spirit of God has assured him, will always appear as a word that God has given him *at the moment*, that *in these definite circumstances* he may fulfil the trust of his calling. We require thus only to keep in view the prophet's *conciousness of his peculiar vocation* to see that the specific quality of prophetic discourse, as regards the points noticed above, is satisfactorily explained as the result of an assurance wrought immediately by the Spirit of God, and perfectly similar in kind to the *testimonium internum Spiritus Sancti*, as to *what in a particular case is to be announced as the will and purpose of God.*[1]

Of course, however, this consciousness of vocation

[1] Similar is the case of the man who having, apart from the possibility of much reflection, spoken the right word in difficult circumstances or at critical moments in fulfilment of his official or Christian duty, declares from the depths of his consciousness: *It was given me.* König's objection to this analogy (ii. p. 195, note) is off the point, for, of course, the prophet's consciousness of his vocation adds something specific to the bare certainty that the word has been given him by God.

could not be present to the mind of the prophet with such extraordinary force were not *special* revelations vouchsafed to him, such as God does not grant to every spiritual man, but only to the prophet. True as it is that the business of the prophet is not primarily to foretell the future, the strength of his consciousness of a Divine mission is hardly conceivable apart from the experimental certainty that Jehovah reveals His counsels to His prophets as to trusted servants, and that they therefore have above all others an anticipatory knowledge of the future. Apart from this, indeed, prophetic discourse would lack the very element necessary to vindicate to their contemporaries the claim of the prophets to be the ambassadors of God.[1] But even for the subjective Divinely-wrought assurance of the prophet as to the counsel of God for the future we have a perfectly exact analogue in the domain of religious experience.[2] I refer to *assurance of answer to prayer*, in particular to cases in which the prayer relates to matters belonging either wholly or in part to the domain of the outer life. Such assurance also is not reflective, nor indeed in any sense a product of the human spirit. Like the prophetic certainty, it is immediately wrought in the spirit of the petitioner by the Spirit of God,

[1] Cp. my remarks in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1872, pp. 558 ff.; Küper in *loc. cit.* pp. 442 f.

[2] The analogy is noted also by Oehler, art. "Weissagung," p. 639, *Theologie des Alten Testamentes*, ii. § 211. I may be allowed to remark that the suggestion to make use of it did not reach me first through Oehler.

and comes to his consciousness as an answer vouchsafed him by the living God, to Whom he has spoken. The certainty of the true petitioner that he has received the answer from God Himself—that it is no mere imagination, but rather an experience as real and matter-of-fact as any outward occurrence—is just as indubitable, and shows itself just as powerful and effective, as the certainty of the prophet—perfectly similar to it in kind and origin—that God has spoken to him. We all know how in the Psalms, in consequence of an inward assurance of an answer from God, the language of the bitterest complaint and most imploring entreaty passes frequently into that of most joyful confidence, even of exulting praise of the Divine grace. Sometimes this transition is so remarkable that to those whose standpoint does not admit of their doing justice to the true inner essence of prophecy, it seems explicable only on the assumption that already the deliverance from distress, or at least a change for the better in the position of the suppliant, has intervened.[1] Experiences of certainty as to answer to prayer, which cannot be brought under suspicion as "so called," or even as products of "religious confusion,"[2] might be cited from ancient and from modern times. It may suffice, however, only to call to mind the answer which the Apostle Paul received to his thrice-uttered entreaty;[3] and the confidence with

[1] Cp. Hitzig, *Die Psalmen*, i. p. 128.
[2] "Religiöser Verirrung," König, ii. pp. 200 f.
[3] 2 Cor. 12. 8 f.

which Peter, after prayer, called to the dead Tabitha: "Tabitha, arise."[1] OEHLER very justly reminds us that this analogy deserves the more attention from the fact that the intercourse of the prophet with God during the process of revelation is not unfrequently represented as, properly speaking, a *prayer-intercourse*,[2] that prayer is even named as the condition of revelation,[3] and that correspondingly the word *'ānāh* (answered) is employed to denote the answer to prayer, which consists of a revelation made to the prophet.[4]

The gift of prayer is a common gift of grace; nevertheless, there are isolated instances of petitioners who possess a special *charisma*, or grace-endowment, in virtue of which they frequently enjoy, even while they pray, an inward assurance regarding the granting or refusal, even of petitions that relate only to the external life.[5] Similarly the assurance as to what is contained in the secret counsel of God, which the

[1] Acts 9. 40. [2] Jer. 32. 16 ff., 42. 4, Hab. 1. [3] Jer. 33. 2 f.
[4] Jer. 23. 35. 37, 33. 3, Micah 3. 7, Hab. 2. 2.

[5] König's polemic against our use of the above analogy (in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 196 ff.) rests almost entirely upon a misunderstanding. He supposes us to affirm that the possession of assurance of answer to prayer *makes* the possessor a prophet. His description, moreover, of such assurance as originating entirely in the human heart, as "only the creation of the praying soul," only "a conscious or unconscious inference from the general to the particular in the matter of saving assurance," something, therefore, that belongs entirely to the sphere of mere subjectivity, forces one to ask, Where in this view is his faith in the living God? The fact is, that just as there are different degrees of certainty in regard to the answer of prayer, so there are, according to circumstances, *different degrees in the inward certainty of a prophet* as to whether or not the word that has come to him be really the word of Jehovah (cp. Jer. 32. 6–8). Of course, however, he can announce it only after he has attained full certainty.

Spirit of God effects in the prophet, presupposes a *special charisma*. This charisma has, however, a basis in nature. In the case alike of the prophet and the exceptional petitioner, it is communicated by an operation of the Spirit of God, which sanctifies and sublimates the *faculty of presentiment* in the human soul,—a faculty which is unquestionably possessed by some individuals in an exceptionally high degree, and attains the closest resemblance to the prophetic charisma when it is roused to activity by the force of deep ethical convictions.[1]

If this be a correct description of the regular mode of revelation to the prophets, it becomes clear, in the *first* place, how completely a *normal ethico-religious attitude* on the part of the prophet to God is an essential prerequisite to the proper exercise of his gift.[2] For, as we have remarked above, it is precisely the ethico-religious character of a would-be prophet's work which must decide the question whether he has really received revelations from God, or whether his claims are fictitious. Even the prophet's own certainty that he is announcing the word of God is conditioned by the testimony of his conscience that this is what he is honestly setting his will to do (see above, p. 16). Hence it is, *secondly*, that in presenting truths of which he has been assured by the Spirit of

[1] For a detailed treatment of the natural basis of the *chárisma prophēteías*, see THOLUCK in *loc. cit.* pp. 1 ff., and the passages there cited. König's objections to the concluding sentence above result from gross misinterpretation (in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 201 f.).

[2] Cp. on this OEHLER, art. "Weissagung," pp. 639 f.

God, the specific mental characteristics of the prophet must make themselves fully perceptible. For such an assurance cannot even enter the prophet's consciousness unless there be some preliminary correspondence between the operation of the Spirit of God and the receptive activity of the human spirit, which assimilates the impression made by the Spirit by transforming it into the form of thought or intuition. A communication, moreover, of his assured truth to others is impossible, unless the prophet exert upon it his reproductive activity in an effort in which reflection, phantasy, and in general all the spiritual powers display themselves in the measure and manner prescribed by *his own spiritual idiosyncracy.*[1] Viewed in this aspect, the word of God which he announces is also the prophet's own word. It is something which, as regards its ultimate origin, does not proceed *millibbo* (from his heart), but yet at the same time, in a true sense, *does* so proceed—as is acknowledged even by König (in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 361 f.). *Finally*,—and this the point that here mainly concerns us,—it is likewise clear that, though the fresh truth, communicated to the prophet in revelation, is one immediately given him by the Spirit of God, *its apprehension can never be unmediated. It cannot be an act that stands in no organic connexion with the cognitions, concepts, and ideas already present to the mind of the prophet. Rather must it be organically summoned by the Spirit of God to the light of consciousness out of that which is already*

[1] Cp. Pfleiderer, *Die Religion, ihr Wesen u. ihre Geschichte*, i. p. 379.

the spiritual property of the prophet, and that without hurt to the freshness proper to revealed truth.[1] For how could the Spirit of God produce in the prophet certainty in regard to matter wholly strange and absolutely new to his spirit—something which he could not recognise in its connexion and agreement with the total previous content of his consciousness, and fit into its appropriate place? A truth not psychologically mediated by connexion with the previous contents of consciousness, could result only from a magical operation of the Spirit of God upon the spirit of the prophet. In other words, it could only be put into the prophet in an external and mechanical way. It is impossible to suppose that any truth, or even the immediate certainty regarding the will and counsel of God, peculiar to the prophet, could originate in this way. The law which is valid in the sphere of the natural life is not less valid in the spiritual sphere: the law, that nothing can be mechanically received into a living organism, or in a purely external way drawn into its life-process and activity. In the one sphere as in the other, there can be appropriation only through a process of assimilation conditioned by the laws of the receptive faculties; and this process of assimilation

[1] König, indeed, conceives of two "sums" of thoughts and concepts, sharply and definitely distinguished from each other, the one of which springs from Divine revelation without any psychological medium, while the other originates in the prophet's own mind (in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 184 f., 214 f., 220). But, as we saw, he found it impossible to work out his theory in full detail.

is, in the present instance, possible only when the fresh truth of revelation finds not merely certain *supposed external points of connexion*, but real roots, or *concealed beginnings of its growth*, in the previous contents of the prophet's consciousness. The organic connexion between the latter and the new truth must therefore be in some measure *genetic*. This is demanded by the constitution of man's spiritual being, in accordance with which the receptive and assimilating activity of the spirit in relation to a new truth is only possible, when the new apprehension so offers itself that the existing store of apprehensions is enriched by a living growth from within outwards, and not by mere mechanical addition, somewhat after the fashion in which, in building, one stone is laid upon another [1] (see above, p. 45). The degree of this organic connexion between old and new may, however, of course, vary according to the peculiarities of particular cases, in such a way that the predicate *new* is claimed for the revealed truth, now in a lower, now in a higher sense. The new apprehension, *objectively* regarded, may be simply the unfolding of a certain germinal know-

[1] As regards König's criticism of the above (in *loc. cit.*, ii. pp. 217 ff.), be it remembered that we here presuppose as *proven* the position that the *hearing of the speech of God* is an *inner* assurance regarding God's counsel and will. But even if we accepted König's literalistic view, his hypothesis of an accommodation on the part of the speaking God would have to be extended to the point required by the theory we prefer, unless, indeed, we are content to assume that the prophet was, like a pupil who has learnt his lesson by "mere verbal repetition," appropriating it only as a kind of unintelligible ballast to the memory,—an assumption which König himself expressly repudiates (p. 219).

ledge already contained in the consciousness of the prophet, only the unfolding process is not effected by the conscious exercise of his understanding and reason. At the moment of revelation he is conscious only of the *result* of the process as something given. He is not conscious of the development of the new truth out of those which are already his spiritual possession, and it is only afterwards, if at all, that he can, as it were, count up the items of the given total, and clear up by reflection the genetic connexion of the new with the old. But, apart from this, the organic relation of which we speak may reveal itself in the fact that the new truth reconciles contradictory elements in the existing contents of the prophet's consciousness, or that, by, as it were, filling a gap in the complex of his prophetic intuitions, it seems to him the solution of a riddle. This is particularly the case where the new truths are not of a purely ideal character, but relate rather to the concrete facts of future history. Such truths cannot manifestly be related to the existing knowledge of the prophet in a purely genetic way, as if the related terms were but the necessary steps in a process of abstract reasoning. The rule may be laid down that in all cases in which the peculiar prophetic *charisma*, based as it is on the natural faculty of presentiment, operates with marked prominence, the predicate *new* is applicable to the truths enunciated in *the higher sense*. Yet even such truths can be taken up into the consciousness of the prophet only in a manner conformable with the laws of the human spirit.

In spite of their newness, they cannot be added to his existing knowledge in an external way, but they must so *grow* out of it that the new shoots of spiritual impulse derive the nourishment necessary, so to speak, to their organic outfit through numerous delicate arteries from the old stem. As a *whole*, the truth may fairly be regarded as a *new* one; yet, for all that, it *must* be possible to exhibit some genetic connexion between the individual moments of its apprehension and the apprehensions previously attained by the prophet.

A mode of revelation which thus respects the nature and laws of the spiritual life seems, moreover, to be the only one worthy of God. For to assume that revelations were made to the prophets in a way that condemned their previous apprehensions of truth to absolute disuse, involves surely an unworthy conception of God. No!—the Spirit of God is not for ever beginning His work afresh, nor is that work to be conceived as an external process of dismemberment, whose express design is continuously to set aside and conceal the inner connexions of the total truth. He rather makes it His function to develop the germs that lie concealed in existing apprehensions, to bring them by constant impulse to the point at which they shall discover their hidden treasures, and cause the new truth organically to blossom forth from them under the reciprocal action of those influences which by the laws of their own life-force they exert upon one another in the natural progress of their develop-

ment. It is really only a revelation of such a kind and manner that can be called worthy of God.[1]

Hence it follows that the question as to the origin of a Messianic prophecy is answered in a truly satisfactory way only when it is shown how that origin has been *psychologically mediated,* or more particularly, *what roots and germs of it were contained in the previous consciousness of the prophet, and in what way it was organically developed from them.* In dealing with any *particular* case we should have not only to investigate what portion of the national life the prophet, as

[1] In the above dissertation we have expressly noticed only the mode of revelation which we have recognised as the one that is usual—the one that is to be *presumed* as having been actually employed in by far the majority of cases. It would be easy, however, to show that our exposition is in all essential respects valid even in relation to the revelations received in ecstasy or by means of visions, as indeed may be seen from what has already been indicated in regard to the psychological genesis of the latter (pp. 45 f.). It would take us too far beyond the proper object of our investigation, as well as the limits of an introductory treatise like the present, to enter upon a criticism of the view of König (in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 25–48), that in their visions the prophets saw with their bodily eyes appearances and events of the supersensible world, which God summoned before them in an external sensible way. We remark only that, on this point, he lays the chief emphasis upon the fact that, in describing their own visions, the prophets use only the verb *rā'āh*, never *chāzāh* (as a finite verb or as a participle), whereas the latter word is used of the visions of the *false* prophets. His theory is that by this contrast between *rā'āh* and *chāzāh* the prophets meant to indicate that their own visions were a "proper seeing," whereas those of the false prophets were "as produced through a psychological medium, not a seeing in the proper sense," rather "a projection outwards of the results of a purely internal process" (p. 30). Had this really been the intention of the prophets, they would surely have taken care to mark the alleged contrast between *rā'āh* and *chāzāh* much more distinctly than they really do (König makes use of Ezek. 13. 3 in a way which the words do not warrant). They would not have awkwardly concealed it by using—if not the verb *chāzāh* itself—

occupying the highest religious standpoint attainable in his time, has, so to speak, absorbed into his consciousness through his acquaintance with the law and history of his people, with the prophecies of his predecessors, with the constitution of the theocracy, etc. We should have to inquire also what knowledge he has of the conditions and circumstances of the time when he writes, what he has personally observed and experienced in relation to his compatriots, what acquaintance he has with the great events of history, and with the contemporary circumstances of other peoples, etc.

at least its derivatives, *chāzūth*, *chāzōn*, *chizzāyon*, of the visions of the true prophets, and, in a broader sense, of revelation in general; and, on the other hand, by using *rā'āh* in an "improper" as well as a "proper" sense. Yet König himself has been at pains to show that such is in both particulars the usage of the prophets (pp. 33 ff.). The real state of the case is as follows: *rā'āh* is by its root-meaning the proper and usual prose word in ancient Hebrew for *to see*. The root idea of *chāzāh*, on the other hand, is that of the material action of *splitting, cleaving asunder*. Hence, in a spiritual sense, it is a choicer word than *rā'āh*. In ancient Hebrew it is thus used mainly in poetry, or else for the sake of variety in expression, as a synonym with *rā'āh* (cp. Ex. 24. 10 f., Isa. 30. 10, Job 19. 26 f.). In later Hebrew, however, especially in the Books of Chronicles, it is used with equal frequency in prose. Thus *rā'āh* and *hir'āh* were undoubtedly the words most suitable and readiest to hand to denote visions that were *real* in the sense of being referable to God as their author, and it is, as a rule, of such visions that we have prose accounts. On the other hand, *chāzāh* (of which there is no *Hiph'il* in general use) is not of itself sufficient to denote the *pretentious self-deceiving character* of the visions of the false prophets. For this such common additions as *shāv'*, *sheḳer*, *millibbam*, etc. (vanity, falsehood, from their heart), are necessary. In spite, moreover, of all that König says, the fact cannot be blinked, that the derivative *ro'ĕh* is used in Isa. 28. 7 of the visions of false prophets; while, on the other hand, *chozim* is used in Is. 30. 10 as parallel to *ro'im*, and *that*, in words uttered by the prophet himself, not in those quoted from the people, and is therefore not exclusively referable to the false prophets.

In dealing, on the other hand, with the question as to the origin of Messianic prophecy in *general*, the one essential matter is to perceive that the prophets were above others those members of the theocratic nation who had the *law of their God in their heart* (Ps. 37. 31, Is. 51. 7, cp. Deut. 30. 14), or, to express the same thing more generally, that they before others were, so to speak, the bearers and representatives of the religion of Israel. And if the obvious admission be made, that the most essential element in Messianic prophecy is of an *ideal* as distinguished from a concrete character, —not relating, *i.e.*, to the details of future history,—we shall have to exhibit the requisite organic connexion between the truths revealed to the prophets and their previous religious knowledge as on the whole mainly a purely genetic one. That is to say, the revealed truths will appear in greatly preponderating measure as but the development of an already existing germinal knowledge— a development, albeit, that is not effected by the conscious exercise of the prophet's own understanding and reason.

We must not seek to prove that this germinal knowledge belongs *to the series of those isolated prophetic utterances* which have been communicated in the course of the Old Testament narrative from the so-called *Proto-Evangel* down to the time of the prophets. At least we must not claim that it does so exclusively or even chiefly. Historical criticism cannot find in the traditions regarding these prophetic sayings, which are preserved in the Pentateuch, a foundation for a history of prophecy which should reach back to the time of

the Patriarchs and the beginnings of the human race. In a first view it can recognise in them only a testimony to the fact that in later times and under the influence of prophecy certain views were formed regarding the economy of revelation which was preparatory to and prophetic of the kingdom of God founded in Israel. But even if a properly historical character, in the fuller sense, were rightfully claimed for these traditions, the opinion that the Messianic element in prophecy must trace its roots and first beginnings specially to them would still be unwarranted. Were this opinion in accordance with the facts, we should necessarily expect to find in Messianic prophecy —from its beginning onwards—characteristic references to these primitive models of Divine promise. We should find points of connexion with them, echoes of them. But where shall we look for the effects on Messianic prophecy of such conceptions as that of the seed of the woman that should bruise the head of the serpent, or of the blessing of all the nations of the earth in the seed of Abraham, or of the star that should rise from Jacob? The soil from which the spirit of revelation caused such conceptions to grow is manifestly much broader and more comprehensive than the contents of those isolated oracles of which tradition reported. It comprehends the general principles and fundamental truths of the Old Testament faith.[1]

[1] A work therefore, like that of von Orelli's cited above, which promises to exhibit Old Testament prophecy "in its historical development," ought not to be content with the traditional mode of showing how, beginning from the so-called Proto-Evangel, prophecy advances

Hence our object will be to show *how it was both possible and necessary that the Messianic hopes and prophecies should proceed from the inmost heart of the religion of the ancient covenant-people, — a religion founded and developed by Divine revelation.* We must discover in the essence of this religion the ground of that expectant *look* and *effort* forwards to a glorious consummation—foreordained by the unalterable decree of God, and to be reached "in the end of the days"[1]— which are so characteristic of it, and have made it, alone of the religions of antiquity, the religion of hope.[2]

Now it may be said in general that this ground lay in the *idealism* of the Old Testament religion of revelation. It lies, that is to say, in the fact that revelation implanted in the religious consciousness of Israel ideas of such great, deep, and rich significance, that it was never possible to recognise in actual conditions and

through such stages as the *Blessing of Noah*, the *Promises to the Patriarchs*, the *Blessing of Jacob* (so called), the *Prophecies of Balaam*, etc., to ever-increasing definiteness. The whole style of treatment is misleading and unhistorical. In Hengstenberg's *Christology* it corresponds indeed with the author's standpoint, whereas in von Orelli it appears only as the result of a one-sided supernaturalism, and of traditional views of the authorship of the Old Testament writings, that do not harmonise with his own main positions. Cp. *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1883, pp. 807 ff.

[1] [The *b'achărith hayyāmim* of Isa. 2. 2, Micah 4. 1, etc.—Tr.]

[2] Küper (in *loc. cit.* pp. 48 and 55) considers the above, along with the inferences we proceed to draw from it, "likely to lead to grave misapprehensions," on the ground that it fails "to do full justice" to the objective character of Messianic prophecy. But his objection: "Prophecy is not a psychological product, but a Divine revelation," does not touch my argument, as I have not denied to prophecy the attribute of revelation. At the same time, however, I *did* endeavour to "do full justice" to the proposition, which even he concedes (p. 54):

circumstances any measurable approximation to their perfect realisation, ideas that at every stage in the development of religious life and knowledge in Israel revealed more of their proper depth and richness, and whose power thus necessarily gave to the religious life at every point of its development that peculiar *direction forwards* to a still future goal. The more keenly a pious Israelite realised the contradiction between the idea and the reality,—and who could be more aware of it than the prophet, distinguished by the intensity of his religious life and the wealth and purity of his religious and ethical knowledge?—the more necessarily did his faith, hope, and longing direct themselves to the future and final removal of the contradiction, and the perfect realisation of the idea. We have now to consider more minutely the most important of these ideas,

that the revealing operations of the Divine Spirit maintain themselves in harmony with the laws of the human spirit, and that therefore all revelation is psychologically mediated. König's adverse criticism (ii. pp. 303 ff.) culminates in the proposition: that God has so revealed Himself, "that there is no genetic connexion between human historical development and Divine revelation," and that "there is no ground for wonder that God has not rooted His revelation in anything human." I content myself with the counter question: Is, then, the religion of Israel, are the fundamental truths of the Old Testament faith, something purely "human," to which Divine revelation can be thus absolutely opposed? Moreover, König himself remarks incidentally that the *Tōrath Yahᵉveh* (Law of Jehovah), announced by the prophets, is "never more than an unfolding of ancient germs" (ii. p. 335). The statement of his latest work (*Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte*, 1884, p. 41) is even more explicit—viz. that "the universalistic hopes of the religion of Israel were the natural and necessary result of the Hebrew view of the relation of God to the world; that they, in fact, grew from it by, so to speak, the *native impulse of a living germ.*"

those, viz., which are to be regarded as the germinal ideas out of which Messianic prophecy grew. In doing so we take for granted that the root thoughts of the Old Testament religion do not date merely from the era of prophecy, but are the fruit of the initial and fundamental revelation mediated by Moses, and belong therefore to the pre-prophetic period. The right to this assumption rests on the indisputable fact that even the oldest prophets announce these root thoughts as old truths, which were made known to the Israelites at the time of the exodus from Egypt.[1] We need not, however, pause to investigate precisely the expression of them that may have been given by Moses. It is sufficient for our purpose to concentrate attention on the form they have attained when the prophets, whose Messianic utterances are before us, received them into their consciousness,[2] and this we regard as something that remains essentially one and the same; for the progressive development sought to be traced in the teaching of successive prophets, so far as it really exists, does not touch the essence of the root-thoughts themselves, but only their form of presentation.[3]

[1] On this cp. Smend, *Ueber die von den Propheten des 8 Jahrhunderts vorausgesetzte Entwickelungstufe der israelitischen Religion*, in *Stud. u. Kritik*, 1876, Pt. 4, esp. pp. 622 ff.; König in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 334–347; and his work, *Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitschen Religionsgeschichte gegenüber den Entwickelungstheoretikern beleuchtet*, Leipzig 1884.

[2] The want of unanimity as to the literary origin of the Pentateuch, in particular, as to the date of the so-called *Grundschrift* (Original or Primitive Document), is therefore to us a matter of subordinate importance.

[3] With this verdict Reuss agrees, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testamentes*, 1881, p. 316.

There are *three* ideas which, above others, demand our special attention: the idea of the *Covenant*, the immediately related idea of the *Kingdom of God*, and, as the germ of Messianic prophecy in the narrower sense, the idea, not indeed Mosaic, yet still pre-prophetic, of the *Theocratic Kingship*.

I. The idea of the *covenant* on which Jehovah entered with Israel is the fundamental and principal idea of the entire Old Testament religion. It is the centre to which the sum-total of Israel's faith and religious knowledge is uniformly referred. It governs the consideration and presentation of the entire history of Israel, and, indeed, of the prehistoric period, back to the very beginnings of the human race, and it is the root-thought of prophecy. An attempt has, indeed, been made of late to prove that while the older prophets (Amos, Isaiah, Micah) recognise the existence of a special relation of Israel to Jehovah, they have not yet begun to regard this relation as that of a *covenant*, and that only shortly before the Exile, in consequence probably of the solemn acceptance by Josiah and the people of the Deuteronomic law-book, the idea of the *covenant* that prevails in Deuteronomy, in Lev. 17–26, in the Book of the Four Covenants,[1]—the so-called Primitive Document of the Pentateuch,—and is assumed by the prophets Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Deutero-Isaiah, was advanced to a central position in the religious

[1] [This document is now more generally known as the *Priestly Code*. See Appendix A, Note IV.—Tr.]

consciousness.[1] It must perhaps be conceded that the practice of designating the relation between Jehovah and His people by the term *covenant* became *usual* with the prophets only with the commencement of the Deuteronomic period.[2] Still we must remember that the word occurs in this sense even in Hosea[3] and in some of the admittedly elder portions of the Pentateuch.[4] Above all, it must be borne in mind that the separate elements of the conception of the relation of Jehovah to Israel, which have received a comprehensive expression in the term *b'rith* (covenant), including the circumstances, that the relation depended upon the obedience of Israel, and yet was not wholly removable on God's side, can not only be traced in the pages of both the elder and the eldest prophets, but also belong to what they designate as truth that had been announced as early as the time of the exodus from Egypt.[5]

It is sufficient for our purpose briefly to unfold the significance of the covenant idea in its most essential elements. As an element of fundamental importance we emphasise, first of all, the fact that, though the covenant is, in idea, a compact-relation, involving a reci-

[1] Cf. WELLHAUSEN, *Geschichte Israels*, i. 1878, pp. 434 f., and *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 1883, pp. 442 f. [*Eng. Transl.* p. 402.]

[2] Cp. on this GUTHE, *De foederis notione Jeremiana*, Leipzig 1877, esp. pp. 10 ff.

[3] Hos. 6. 7, 8. 1. [4] *E.g.* Ex. 19. 5, 24. 7 f.

[5] Cp. REUSS, *Die Geschichte der h. Schriften Alten Testamentes*, pp. 322 and 324; KÖNIG in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 338 ff., and in the work, *Die Hauptprobleme*, etc., pp. 84 f.; BREDENKAMP, *Gesetz und Propheten*, 1881, pp. 21 ff. Even GUTHE (in *loc. cit.*) admits that by his use of the term *b'rith* Jeremiah has not imported any essentially new element into the conception of the relation of Jehovah to Israel.

procity of obligations, still the mutual obligations have been fixed wholly by the one side, viz. by Jehovah in the exercise of His unconditioned freedom and independence. *Jehovah therefore is the sole Founder of the covenant.* This is a view which is deeply rooted in Israel's consciousness of God, and which notoriously has stamped itself upon the phraseology commonly employed to denote the establishment of the covenant-relation.[1] The foundation, therefore, of the consciousness of Israel, as regards his peculiar relation to God, is the belief that Jehovah, the Lord of the world, has in the absolute freedom of His gracious will chosen Israel from among all the peoples of the earth to be His peculiar people (Ex. 19. 5, Amos 3. 2). Now undoubtedly there is a view which pervades all the Pentateuch traditions, and occupies, besides, an important place in the consciousness of the prophets (cp. even Isa. 29. 22, Micah 7. 20), to the effect that the progressive fulfilment of this elective decree dates from the first beginnings of history, being prepared for by the gradual separation of Israel from other peoples, and specially by the relation of peculiar intimacy on which God entered with the patriarchs. All the Pentateuch traditions, moreover, tell of prophetic announcements of this decree in the form of Divine promises made to Abraham and his posterity, and confirmed to the succeeding patriarchs;[2] and the designation, in

[1] Cp. Oehler, *Theologie des Alten Testamentes*, § 80.

[2] Cp., on the one hand (Elohistic), Gen. 17. 7 f., 28. 3 f., 35. 11 f.; on the other (Jehovistic), Gen. 12. 2 f., 13. 14 ff., 18. 18 f., 22. 16 ff., 26. 3 ff., 28. 3 f.

the Jehovistic document, of Jehovah as the "God of Shem" (Gen. 9. 26), in the blessing of Noah, is meant to mark His future relation to Israel.

Still it is only in the redemptive act of the deliverance from Egypt that the elective decree attains its full accomplishment. This is an experience of the redeeming might and grace of Jehovah which is national and historical, and it results from it that the word of God, mediated by Moses, becomes, throughout the continuance of the Old Covenant, the foundation of Israel's confidence that Jehovah is his God, and that he himself is Jehovah's peculiar people, whom He has separated from other peoples and won for Himself (Ex. 15. 16, 2 Sam. 7. 23 f.). The redemption from Egyptian bondage occupies thus in the religious consciousness of Israel the place which in our Christian consciousness belongs to God's deed of redemption through Jesus Christ.[1] On the basis of this deliverance and of the law announced at Mount Sinai, the covenant between Jehovah and Israel is definitely fixed (Ex. 6. 2–8, 19. 4 ff., 24. 3 ff.). It is a covenant with the people as a whole, for God's deliverance was a national experience, and the individual Israelite is in covenant with his God in the first instance only in so far as he is a member of the nation.

[1] It may be called to mind that even Old Testament prophecy expressly institutes a parallel between the Messianic deeds of salvation and the deliverance from Egypt and entrance into the holy land, regarding the former as the second, higher and fuller realisation of what was signified by the election of the ancient covenant-people (cp. *e.g.* Isa. 10. 26, 11. 1. 16, chap. 12, Micah 7. 15, Jer. 23. 6 ff., chap. 31, Isa. 65. 9, etc.).

In consequence of the election and the covenant, Jehovah is the *God of Israel.* This by no means implies merely that Israel shall worship and obey Him alone, as his national God. It implies also that He will be what He is in particular for Israel, *i.e.* that He will reveal Himself to Israel as the living God, in His holiness, in the fulness of His power, and the riches of His grace. To this people it must be made evident how merciful and gracious, long-suffering and of great grace and truth, He is, yet how hostile to all evil. To no other people does He so show Himself as God; other peoples are indeed made aware of His Divine power and holiness, but not in the first instance by His becoming their helper and redeemer, but either by His using them for the accomplishment of His decrees regarding Israel, or by His visiting them with judgment for Israel's sake. His whole revelation on earth is thus directly only a revelation made to Israel and for his advantage. The beginning of this gracious revelation of Jehovah as the God of Israel is the Exodus, which is thus *the* event of fundamental importance,[1] but its continuation is the fact that Jehovah *dwells* among His people,[2] and when He has put them in possession of the promised land, He reigns among them as their present King. Israel is made aware of His gracious presence and government by the feeling of security, freedom, and independence,

[1] Cp. Jehovah's self-designation in the preface to the Ten Words, Ex. 20. 2, and passages like Lev. 19. 36, Ex. 6. 6 f., 29. 46, and many others.

[2] Ex. 29. 45, Lev. 26. 11 f., Ezek. 37. 27.

by the vincibility of enemies, by the peaceful possession of his appointed territory, by rapid numerical increase, by wise social arrangements, by material wealth—specially by the rich productivity of the land, by protection from plagues and other national calamities—in short, by his national prosperity and greatness. Yet all this is but the outer side of the higher blessing of salvation vouchsafed to this people; they are near to the living God, can come to Him and inquire of Him, receive from Him the most righteous laws and ordinances of life, are constantly directed by His Spirit and word through chosen organs, and are heard when they call upon Him. It is by this that Israel is distinguished above all the peoples of the earth (Ex. 33. 16, Deut. 4. 7 f.). As the people who are near to God, and can come near, they have the dignity and the privilege of a priestly people (Ex. 19. 6).[1]

On the other hand, however, God as the Holy One can enter on this alliance with Israel only in such a way as to preserve—even in relation to Israel—His holiness, *i.e.* His sublime transcendence and His stainless purity. He must, so to speak, sublimate His chosen and peculiar people into the sphere of His holiness. He must lift them out of their natural connexion with the profane, impure Gentile world, who serve false gods. The opposition of His holy

[1] It is not, however, implied in the expression *mamlĕkheth kohănim* (kingdom of priests), as used in Ex. 19. 6, that Israel, as a priestly people, exercises the mediatorial function of representing humanity before God.

being to the "no-Gods" of the heathen, and to the impurity associated with their worship, must find its earthly antitype in the separateness of Israel from all other peoples. As the Sanctifier,[1] therefore (*m'ḳaddēsh*), Jehovah constitutes Israel a *holy people* (Ex. 19. 6, Lev. 20. 26). In this way there is established no mere external distinction, but rather mainly an inward separateness of the Israelitish nationality from that of other peoples. Their whole political constitution bears an impress distinct from that of other States;[2] the life of the people as a whole is otherwise ordered and shaped from the fact that it is placed exclusively under the determining influence of the holy will of Jehovah. This peculiar holiness of Israel is primarily a Divine endowment—a character impressed upon him by God. Yet in it Israel's problem and destiny are set before him. For the whole mutual relation of Jehovah and Israel is made dependent upon the condition that Israel hear the voice of Jehovah and keep His covenant (Ex. 19. 5). By making allowance, in this way, for the reciprocity of obligation implicit in the idea of a covenant, the Old Testament creed does justice to human freedom—in particular, to the truth that in His relation to men God does not, as in the kingdom of nature, set all things in motion by the sole instrumentality of all-pervading force, but leaves room for human freedom. The kingdom of God

[1] Ex. 31. 13, Lev. 20. 8, 21. 8, 22. 16. 32, Ezek. 20. 12, 37. 28 as compared with Lev. 21. 15. 23, 22. 9, Num. 8. 17.

[2] Cp. the complaint of Isaiah (2. 6–8).

founded in Israel bears an ethical character. Israel has to keep the character of holiness that has been vouchsafed to him; by faithfulness and obedience to his God and King he must remain a people distinct from the heathen peoples. He is under obligation to keep himself as pure and free as possible from everything, that would tend to the dishonour of the holy God, to Whom he is allied, and with Whom he has intercourse, from physical impurities,[1] as well as from ethical stain.[2] And the requirement: "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy," has no mere negative significance; it is a summary of the entire legislation.[3] Judged by its inmost essence, the latter is nothing less than the revelation of the ethical perfection of God, as appears in the form of the demand, Isa. 2. 5, which implies that the light of the law is the reflected light of Jehovah, and its design is so to shape the national life of Israel, that it will exhibit an ever-increasing resemblance to the holiness of God, and Israel becomes thus in the full sense of the words a *gōi ḳādhōsh*, or holy nation.

While, therefore, the covenant relation would be unreal and inefficacious unless there were — corresponding to the gracious end of the Divine election — the experience that Jehovah is Israel's God, and Israel His holy peculiar people, this experience is at every moment conditioned by the fulfilment on the part of the people of the stipulations of the covenant. On no other terms can Jehovah prove Himself Israel's

[1] Lev. 11. 44, 20. 26; cp. 21. 8. [2] Lev. 19. 2, Amos 2. 7 ff.
[3] Lev. 19. 2; Num. 15. 40.

God and Saviour. So emphatically is this the case, that, to meet the case of unfaithfulness and covenant-breaking, there is held out the threat of a withdrawal of all prospective blessings, and of a series of severe punitive judgments, culminating in the scattering of Israel among the heathen. For the very intimacy of the relation on which God has entered with Israel, carries with it the certainty that His jealous anger at the slighting of His holy majesty and the profanation of His holy name will visit none so surely as His own erring people.[1]

As, however, Israel could not coöperate with Jehovah in the institution of the covenant, it must be correspondingly impossible that the continuance of the latter should be altogether dependent upon the attitude of the covenant-people. The preservation of the covenant, as well as its initial establishment, must be preëminently the concern of Jehovah. The *decree of election once passed*, can neither be as though it had not been, nor yet can it be made of none effect,[2] because of Israel's unfaithfulness and the judgments which it entails. The promises which God made in early times to the people, particularly to the fathers of the nation, cannot be annulled through the guilt of one generation, or even of several generations, nor can the purpose of grace, for whose realisation Israel was chosen, be stultified. For God is not a man that He should repent; "hath He said, and shall He not do it? or

[1] Lev. 10. 3, Josh. 24. 19 f., Amos 2. 3.
[2] *Rückgängig gemacht werden.*

hath He spoken, and shall He not make it good?"[1] Though men are unstable and fickle in their attitude to God, there is not on that account any changeableness in Him.[2] No human action can ever make His own purpose impracticable to God. He must find ways and means of carrying it out, and so fulfilling His promises. — It may well be, indeed, that when necessarily Jehovah's wrath is turned against Israel, the exhibition of His covenant-grace is for longer or shorter time suspended, but the covenant itself cannot be for ever dissolved. God cannot for *ever reject* His chosen people,[3] nor can He ever pass upon them, as upon heathen peoples, a decree of annihilation. In view of the covenant which He Himself has founded, in view of the fact that by election and by the promise sworn to the fathers, Israel is and remains His peculiar people, God's judgment must be, as regards Israel, of the nature of *chastisement*,[4] appointed in *love*, to *convert* the people to Himself. God, moreover, knows how to carry out His loving intention,[5] whether it be by the chastisement itself, or by the glorious exhibition of His preventive grace, which puts to shame and eventually conquers even an obstinate contumacy.[6] And so soon as the intention of love is effected, or even while it is being effected, the covenant reverts in full force: God shows Himself again Israel's God and

[1] Num, 23. 19, 1 Sam. 15. 29. [2] Mal. 3. 6.
[3] Cp. *e.g.* Lev. 26. 44 f., 1 Sam. 12. 22, 2 Kings 13. 23.
[4] Jer. 10. 24 f., 46. 28, Ps. 69. 27 ff.
[5] Lev. 26. 40 ff., Deut. 30. 1 ff.
[6] Cp. Ezek. 16. 60 ff., 20. 43 f., 36. 31 f.

Saviour by redeeming him and making him glorious; and that this should be once and for ever again the final result, is demanded as much by His *Holiness* and His *Righteousness* as by His *Faithfulness*.[1] His *Holiness:* for the judgments against Israel consist in his being given over to the violence of heathen peoples, so that it seems for the moment as if human power were in some degree prevailing against God's kingdom, and might effectively obstruct the accomplishment of His decrees; as if there were ground for the vain imagination of the heathen, that the God of Israel had grown faint and could not protect His own, or as if in human fickleness He no longer concerned Himself in behalf of His peculiar people. Were He to leave His own in the power of the heathen, His transcendent majesty, His absolute sovereignty over the world, and the irrevocableness of His decrees would fail to be known upon earth; His holy name would be and would remain desecrated. His honour, therefore, requires Him to protect His own; for His own sake, for His holy name's sake, He must again redeem Israel; by the protection and redemption of His people, and by judgment upon their enemies, He must display His holiness before the eyes of all peoples.[2]—But His *Righteousness* also requires Him, so soon as the end of His punitive judgments is attained in the conversion of Israel, to take up again

[1] See above, and cp. *e.g.* Ex. 32. 11 ff.

[2] Cp. *e.g.* Num. 14. 13 ff., Deut. 9. 26 ff., Ezek. 20. 41, 38. 16. 23, Isa. 48. 9 ff., 52. 5 f.

the cause of His people against their heathen oppressors. For the phrase, *righteousness of God*, has a general and a more special meaning. The former implies that the sentiment and attitude of God towards men correspond to the standard required, on the one hand, by His absolutely good will [1] and His disposition of love; and, on the other, by the relations existing between Himself and the individual or the community. His relation to Israel is, however, by no means conditioned solely by the attitude of Israel. It is rather, first and foremost, one founded on His own declared will of grace. While, therefore, His dealings with Israel can correspond with His righteousness only in so far as they are in harmony with His earnest desire that in His kingdom the evil should be overcome and the good prevail, it is always required at the same time that there be an active operation of His love, *such as will meet the terms of the covenant-relation*. So soon, therefore, as Israel's conversion is proved by his ceasing to oppose the good-will of God in the above sense, God's righteousness requires that He should again, in love, take up the cause of His people. What is, on the one side—in the entire and full sense of the word—*grace* and *faithfulness*, is also, on the other, *righteousness*.[2] But even in the narrower

[1] [*I.e.* His willing what is absolutely good.—Tr.]

[2] Cp. *e.g.* Hos. 2. 19, Ps. 103. 17, and the many other passages in the Psalms in which—not always indeed with special reference to Israel as a *people*—*tsᵉdhāḳāh* is associated with or is the rhythmical parallel of *chěsedh* or *ĕmūnāh* (righteousness, mercy, truth), as Ps. 33. 5, 36. 5 f. 10 f., 40. 10 f., 89. 14, 96. 13, 116. 5, 145. 17; see also the use of *tsᵉdhāḳāh* in Isa. chaps. 40–66.

sense of the term, the righteousness of God, His *judicial right-securing* righteousness demands that Israel should be delivered from the power of the heathen so soon as he turns to his God. For Israel has his rights as over against the heathen; he is by comparison more righteous than they, in so far as he worships the only true God in the persons of the always surviving remnant, who, however few in number, are yet faithful to Jehovah, and compose the true stock of Israel.[1] As the righteous Judge, God cannot suffer the wicked man to doom to destruction one who is more righteous than he. As in His kingdom He undertakes the cause of the pious man so as to protect him from the violence and deceitful snares of the evil-doer,[2] so must He vindicate for Israel, against the idolatrous heathen, the rights that belong to the people who worship the only true God; and that, by a judicial act which at once redeems Israel, and destroys his oppressors.[3]

It is not difficult to see how Messianic prophecy—in the wider sense—both could and must grow out of the idea of the covenant whose development we have traced. It resulted, *firstly*, from the contradiction between idea and reality consequent upon *Israel's various disloyalties;* and, *secondly*, from the contradiction between idea and reality inherent in the *entire character of the Old Covenant and its theocracy*,—a contradiction

[1] 1 Kings 19. 18, Hab. 1. 13.

[2] Cp. *e.g.* Ps. 31. 1, 71. 2, 129. 4.

[3] For passages illustrating in detail this aspect of the Divine righteousness, *i.e.* as vindicating the peculiar rights of the covenant people, see esp. Isa. chaps. 40–66, *e.g.* 41. 10 ff.

which came progressively to the consciousness of pious and enlightened Israelites along with the development and deepening of religious knowledge and life. The *first* point does not require further illustration of a special kind. For the very idea of the covenant, as we have developed it, implies that in times of defection, and of judgments already present or even only in prospect, the eyes of all in whose hearts the Old Testament faith was alive were necessarily turned to the coming better time, in which God's purpose of grace concerning Israel should really be accomplished. However great might be the defection, and however severe the judgment, the election of Israel, the unchanging faithfulness of God, His holiness and His righteousness remained ever the firm pillars of the confident expectation that nevertheless, in the end, a day of redemption would dawn for the people of God,—a time of salvation in which Israel should participate in the full blessing of covenant communion.

The *other* point requires a somewhat more minute consideration. We have remarked above (p. 69) that the covenant was one made with the people as a whole, and that the individual was in the first instance in covenant with God only in so far as he was a member of the nation. Now the progress of the development of the Old Testament religion in the time of prophecy consists in general in this: that on the basis of the common consciousness of the nation in regard to its special relation to God, a relation of *personal* love and trust, experienced by pious individual Israelites

towards the God of Israel, steadily develops itself, and by the intercourse of prayer with God wins increasingly an independent significance. The God of Israel becomes *their* God, not merely in so far as they are Israelites, but also in so far as they carry within themselves the consciousness of a *personal* reciprocal relation of possession in each other as between God and themselves. The covenant-grace becomes a love and faithfulness of God to individual suppliants, which are a matter of personal experience witnessed in the heart. It was a necessary consequence of this development of the subjective religious life, that it became ever a matter of clearer consciousness and stabler conviction, that the idea of the covenant was realised only in a very imperfect way in the theocracy founded by Moses, and that it set before the nation of Israel a goal that was still far distant, but the attainment of which, as its Divine calling and destiny, was as certain in the long run as the Divine decree of election.[1]

To be sure, God dwelt in the sanctuary in the midst of His people, revealed Himself to them by word and deed, and led them by His Spirit. Israel was a priestly people, near to his God, having fellowship and converse with Him. But as the theocracy was in the first instance only, so to speak, an external State of God founded on the natural basis of Hebrew nationality, and as membership among the people of Jehovah was involved in the mere fact of physical descent from the chosen stock, the implied relation of communion

[1] See Appendix A, Note V.

could be primarily, and for the people as a whole, only an external one, and one, to boot, that was tied to the mediation of the Levitical priesthood. The idea that Israel is a priestly people, has for the individual member of the nation in reality only a very limited applicability. Circumcision and the tassels on the fringe of his garment[1] are indeed for every Israelite the external signs of his belonging to God, and of his priestly dignity. Furthermore, he exercises his priestly calling at the yearly renewal of covenant-fellowship in the feast of the Passover.[2] In Sabbaths and feasts he draws near to his God, and at the peace-offering meal he rejoices thankfully in the external completion of his fellowship with God. Yet it is only into the forecourt of the dwelling-place of his God that he dare come; from the Sanctuary itself he is shut out. Only there in reverential distance may he worship a God who is enthroned in the darkness of the Holy of holies, and only by priestly mediation can he bring his offerings to his God. Thus the very ordinances of the external intercourse of worship between Israel with his God contained a reminder of the fact that the covenant communion with God was by no means, as yet, perfect or final.—To pious Israelites, however, this ceremonial intercourse with Jehovah was, by the mere fact of its externality, unsatisfactory; it could not in their eyes be what was intended in the covenant and the election.

[1] Num. 15. 37 ff.

[2] Cp. HUPFELD, *Comment. de primitiva et vera festorum apud Hebraeos ratione*, etc., i. pp. 22 ff.

Every godly man, who carried the law of his God in his heart,[1] and had his delight in the commands of Jehovah, which make wise, rejoice the heart, and refresh the soul, every one who in any degree knew from his own intimate experience how the God of grace and salvation enlightens and leads even the individual by His Holy Spirit,[2] how inwardly near to Him His accepted suppliants come, how He hears and answers them when they call upon Him, and what bliss it is to be able to call God his inheritance and his portion, would necessarily recognise in this *inwardness* of communion with his God what is *most of all essential to the realisation of the idea of the covenant.* And it lay in the nature of the case that the more the contrast between the scant company of the truly godly and the party of the worldly-minded came to be emphasised, the more did the difference of inward attitude to God tend to bring about a division within the circle of the covenant-people, and the more also in consequence did mere physical membership in the covenant-nation, and the outward ritual intercourse with Jehovah necessarily tend, in the consciousness of the godly, to recede in significance and worth behind this truer blessing of inward fellowship and intercourse by prayer with God. It was not in present conditions and circumstances when so many had forgotten God, and thought not of His commandment, that the godly could recognise the fulfilment of the Divine intention in the election and the covenant, but only in

[1] Ps. 37. 31, Isa. 51. 7. [2] Cp. *e.g.* Ps. 51. 11 f., 143. 10.

a time when the covenant-relation should have become in the experience of the *whole people, represented by all its individual members,* that inward living personal fellowship with God which they themselves enjoyed. It was their part, therefore, to await in lively faith in Israel's election, and in love to their people, their God, and His Kingdom, the coming time when the gracious intention of the electing God should be fully accomplished upon the entire elect community by the establishment of the true inward covenant-fellowship, mediated by the enlightening and sanctifying operation of the Spirit of God.

It deserves in this connection to be specially noted that the formula of Divine promise in the Pentateuch —of particularly frequent occurrence in the so-called *Primitive Document* — *W^ehāyīthi lāchĕm lē'lohim* [1] (and I will be to you a God), or, more fully: *W^ehāyīthi lāchĕm lē'lohim, w^eattĕm tih^eyu-li l^eām* [2] (and I will be to you a God, and ye shall be to Me a people), is used by those prophets, whose language has come to reflect a more minute acquaintance with the written law, not only in the same sense,[3] *i.e.* as *initiating* the covenant, but also, and mainly, to designate the relation between Jehovah and Israel which *is to* exist in the *perfect time,*[4]—a distinct testimony that the Messianic salvation is

[1] Gen. 17. 7 f., Ex. 6. 7, 29. 45, Lev. 11. 45, 22. 33, 25. 38, 26. 45, Num. 15. 41.

[2] Lev. 26. 12.

[3] Jer. 7. 23, 11. 4.

[4] Jer. 24. 7, 30. 22, 31. 1, 32. 38, Ezek. 11. 20, 14. 11, 34. 24, 36. 28, 37. 23. 27, Zech. 2. 11, 8. 8; cp. Zech. 13. 9.

apprehended consciously and clearly as the full realisation of the idea of the covenant.

But even the inward relation of fellowship, proper to the godly Israelite, was not without repeated painful disturbance and obscuration. For, *firstly*, it was not simply love to his people, or the keen sense of community with them, that made him sensible of the wrath of God at the unfaithfulness of his people; he felt it at the same time as a disturbance and obscuration of his *personal* communion with God. For the undermost ground of his certainty of personal acceptance with God was no other than the consciousness of Israel's election, and every suspension of the covenant-grace from the people tended necessarily to obscure more or less his personal standing of grace. Hence the pitiful complaints that God has cast away His people from before His face, which we hear in the time of the Exile, and which reveal a deep sense of being forsaken by God in the hearts of the godly. But, *secondly*, the blissful fellowship with God, enjoyed by devout souls, was also liable to obscuration through their *own* sin—and that, the more their knowledge of the will of God was deepened, and the greater in consequence seemed the conditions of covenant fellowship demanded by Him. Deepened knowledge of God meant a deepened sense of sin and guilt. They could indeed attain a firm and joyful certainty of the forgiveness of their sins (Ps. 32); yet not—at least not since the deepening of religious life during the period of prophecy—by the offering of the

Old Testament sacrifices of atonement, rather by their firm faith in the sin-forgiving grace of God. For both the law and the prophets attest the *gospel* contained in the proclamation: "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin.[1]

This sin-forgiving grace of God had not as yet, however, manifested itself in a really sufficient way. Belief in it had not as yet a secure foundation in *fact*, or one that sufficed for every case. If in times of trial and doubt the need of falling back on some such fact-foundation made itself felt, there was nothing to which Old Testament faith could recur but just Israel's election and his previous history; and the deeper the sense of sin, the less did this foundation seem sufficient. Hence the certainty of attained forgiveness could not be either perfect or always present. In timid, shrinking hearts, and in hours of trial, the longing for it frequently remained perforce unsatisfied, and so it came about that the godly minority of the Old Covenant longed and hoped for a relation of personal communion with God such as could be perfect only in a future time, when their sin should be removed by a perfect forgiveness, and every fresh obscuration of their joy in God and the blissful

[1] Ex. 34. 7, Num. 14. 18, Isa. 1. 18, 55. 7, Micah 7. 18. The gracious words of this self-designation are echoed throughout the entire Old Testament—cp. Ex. 34. 6, 33. 19, Joel 2. 13, Nah. 1. 3, Jonah 4. 2; Ps. 86. 15, 103. 8, 111. 4, 145. 8, 2 Chron. 30. 9, Neh. 9. 17. 31.

sense of His nearness should be prevented by some mightier and more lasting operation of the Spirit of God on their heart.

This hope, however, accorded precisely with the Divine intention of Israel's election. For it was involved in the covenant-promise that God would manifest His divine attributes to Israel by becoming his Redeemer and Saviour. With the knowledge of the need for salvation, there grew a corresponding knowledge of God as Saviour, as well as an insight into His purpose of grace and the design of His kingdom. It became therefore necessarily a matter of increasingly clear apprehension to the godly men of the Old Covenant, that if Jehovah was to be in the full sense Israel's God, and Israel His people, *there must be in prospect a revelation of His glory far outshining all previous manifestations—some new and great deed of grace and salvation*—something to remove the barrier to full and lasting covenant-fellowship—in short, *an operation of His sin-forgiving grace, which should do away with sin fully and for ever.* They became always the more assured that God must one day *take up His abode* in the midst of His people in some wholly different and far more glorious way than hitherto. Every one—did he but belong to the people of God—should be truly near to Him, and should participate in the *priestly right* of immediate intercourse with Him. All, from the least even to the greatest, should see His glory and be acquainted with Him. And to bring about this result, He Himself

must circumcise the heart of His people, that they might be able to love their God with their whole heart and soul;[1] He Himself must put His law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts;[2] He must put within them a new heart and a new spirit—even His own, and thus constrain them to walk in His commandments.[3]

In the sphere of the present there was for the Israelite no equivalent to this hope comparable with that which met his eye in the phenomenon of *prophecy*. Not even the priesthood witnessed an operation of the Spirit of God upon men so immediate and so powerful, for it implied no such relation of confidential intimacy[4] —no such constant and lively intercourse with God. In prophecy, however, he could feel — what the prophet himself, of course, in virtue of his peculiar experience felt most of all — that there was the distinctest possible presentation of the goal which, in virtue of his election, Israel should one day attain. Only then is the people of God what it is meant to be, only then is the idea of the covenant completely realised, when the Spirit of God shall have been poured out no longer merely upon individual and select organs, but upon the whole people, — thus fulfilling the early expressed ideal of Moses,[5] that all

[1] Deut. 30. 6. [2] Jer. 31. 33.

[3] Jer. 32. 39, Ezek. 11. 19 f., 36. 26 f. [4] Amos 3. 7.

[5] In the remarkable narrative Num. 11. 16 ff., cp. esp. ver. 29: "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!" Cp. also the familiar passages: Joel 2. 28 f., Ezek. 39. 29, Isa. 54. 13, etc.

should be prophets—pupils of Jehovah, ruled by His Spirit.—It was, moreover, just this presentation—in the fact of prophecy—of the goal which Israel should attain that led to the further perception, that, in virtue of his election, Israel had the same Divine calling to fulfil towards humanity which the prophets had to fulfil within the chosen circle, and that in some future day he would accomplish his mission as the *Servant of Jehovah*, equipped with the Divine Spirit, and entrusted with the proclamation of the word of God. This perception, as is well known, is elaborated with wonderful clearness and in most many-sided intensely significant detail in the prophecies of the "Great Unknown," Isa. chaps. 40–66. With this point we need not concern ourselves further here. Enough has been said to show that the root-idea of the Old Testament religion, the idea, viz., of the covenant, was a living germ and motive-power of Messianic prophecy; and how, on the one hand, every present or prospective judgment of vengeance upon Israel, and on the other every growth in religious knowledge and every deepening of religious life—in particular, every deepening of the yearning for salvation—necessarily tended to produce from this germ the expectation of fresh revelations and deeds of grace, by which in the last days God should conduct His chosen people to their great destiny.

II. We turn now to the *second* idea—closely related to its predecessor—which falls to be considered as one of the principal germs of Messianic prophecy, viz. the

idea of the *Kingdom of God.* Jehovah is the King of His people; as in the sphere of nature all is subject unconditionally to His will, so also is it ordained that His will should be the all-determining norm in the Kingdom which He has erected for Himself in the midst of the people Israel. All the circumstances of His subjects, all their relations to one another, are controlled by Him; all legal ordinances are by Him established; every subject must in obedience to his God and King observe them as holy.

In the Kingdom of God right is not to be overborne by violence or artful stratagem, nor are the social weal and peace to be disturbed, nor, in general, are injustice and crime to be suffered.[1] It is to be a kingdom in which "mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other;"[2] and that it should be, and remain, and always become more so, is the aim of the Kingly regimen of God. For as King He is very specially also Judge,[3] just as even in the case of the human king the exercise of the judicial office is a main part of the work of his calling.[4] As Judge He makes it His task to uphold

[1] The opinion suggested by VATKE (*Bibl. Theol.* i. pp. 207 ff., 260 ff., 476 ff.), and shared by WELLHAUSEN, STADE, and others, that the conception of the Kingdom of God is a simple reflex of the existing human kingdom, is, as Bertheau rightly remarks (*Buch der Richter*, 2nd ed. on Judg. 8. 23), refuted even by the Song of Deborah: cp. also Ex. 15. 18, Deut. 33. 5. There can be no question, however, in any case, but that the idea of the Kingdom of Jehovah occupies a central place in the religious consciousness of the prophets.

[2] Ps. 85. 10. [3] Deut. 10. 17 f., Ps. 96. 10, 89. 14, 97. 2.

[4] Cp. *e.g.* 2 Sam. 15. 4, 1 Kings 3. 9.

equitable order and the authority of His law in His kingdom, to protect all—in a special degree, however, the poor and the needy—in their rights, to waive every violent transgressor back within the confines of right, to make evil-doers harmless by frustration of their plans, and by punishment, and by His judgments extirpate the incorrigible from His Kingdom. But here also the actual conditions and circumstances were in glaring contradiction to the idea. We know how frequently the censures of the prophets are specially directed against the covetous violence of the powerful and the venality of the judges, and how often in the Psalms the "afflicted" must cry to God for help, because as persons without either protection or rights, they are given over to their powerful persecutors. Too often in the kingdom, that was designed to be a kingdom of righteousness, the reins of power were in the hands of evil-doers; too often must those who were "quiet in the land" [1] learn by bitter experience how little, as yet, the Kingdom of God was a kingdom of peace; in actually existing conditions and circumstances the Kingly government of God was still but faintly visible. How natural, therefore, the yearning and hope for a time in which the wicked should no longer be able to disturb the righteous ordinances and the peace of the Kingdom of God! How natural the confident expectation that in some future time Jehovah Himself would take over and conduct in a far more perfect manner the *Kingly government of His*

[1] Ps. 35. 20.

people, so as to suppress all crime, and bring His Kingdom into entire conformity with its ideal![1]

Here also, however, the contradiction between idea and reality was inherent in the very *nature and character of the Old Testament theocracy itself.* It was a natural kingdom of God, lying within the narrow bounds of the land of Canaan, and confined to the chosen people Israel. Only within these bounds was Jehovah known and worshipped; only here did His royal will attain, at least in the better times, recognition and accomplishment. At the most, the influence of His regimen did not extend beyond some tributary neighbours, whom it affected only in a limited degree. And yet Jehovah, the God of Israel, is the only true God, and all the gods of other peoples are dead nothings;[2] to Him alone therefore all honour and worship are due; to Him every knee should bow, and every tongue swear.[3] As Creator of heaven and earth, Israel's King is also King and Lord of the whole earth,[4] the King of all kings, and the Lord of all lords;[5] therefore all peoples should serve Him and obey His commandment. As with His kingly, so with His judicial office; it also extends over the whole earth,[6] and hence most frequently the "earth," the "world," the "peoples," the "nations,"[7] are named as the object

[1] Cp. *e.g.* Isa. 24. 23, 52. 7, Micah 4. 7.

[2] Cp. Deut. 4. 35. 39, 32. 39 et passim. [3] Isa. 45. 23.

[4] Josh. 3. 11. 13, Ps. 47. 7, Ex. 19. 5, Ps. 24. 1, etc.

[5] Deut. 10. 17. [6] Cp. Gen. 18. 25.

[7] Cp. Diestel, "Die Idee der Gerechtigkeit im Alten Testament," in the *Jahrbüchern für deutsche Theologie,* v. 1860, pp. 176 f.

of His judicial activity, and even His judgment of Israel is commonly represented as a judgment of the world. Hence also the legal ordinances of His Kingdom must come into force everywhere on earth, and by His judicial activity righteousness and peace must be secured among all peoples. It belonged essentially to the idea of God, prevalent among his countrymen, that the Israelite should claim the whole earth as the kingdom of his God. For this idea contained from the first the power of lifting its possessor above the initial particularism of the Old Testament religion; in it lay the fertile germ of the knowledge that in the time of its accomplishment in the future, the theocracy must become a universal monarchy of Jehovah, embracing all peoples. The development of this germ might indeed for a time be kept back by the power exercised upon religious perceptions by the nationalistic constitution of the existing theocracy, and by the sharp contrast in which at first Israel was required to stand to other peoples; but with the actual development of the idea of God it necessarily continued to acquire fresh strength, until at last, breaking through its envelope of national particularism, it yielded for sprouts and blossom the Messianic prophecy, that "in the end of the days" all peoples should know Jehovah and submit themselves to His law, and that by His kingly government and judicial activity an end should be put to all war, and the *whole earth become a kingdom of peace.*[1] This result was all the more

[1] The universalistic tendency proper to the Old Testament religion,

inevitable from the circumstance that the Israelite possessed a full and clear consciousness of the *unity of the human race.* Though he felt compelled to regard the heathen world as a *massa perditionis,* forgotten of God,[1] defiled by the abominations (*to'ēbhoth*) of their *filths* (*shiḳḳūtsim*) of worship,[2] and ready for the exterminating stroke of the Divine vengeance,[3] his belief in the one God, who sends forth His Spirit to give life and breath to all people upon earth, prevented him from drawing a line of absolute delimitation *within* humanity. Thus, with unmistakable significance, both stories of the Creation place *one* human pair in the beginning of the history of the human race. *Eve* is so called because she is the "mother of all living,"[4] and all the nations known to the Israelites in the time of the writer of Gen. 10 are traced back to the three sons of Noah. Were the interest involved in such an assertion one that concerned merely physical descent, we should see in it only a comparatively insignificant historical conception. In reality, however, the interest is rather an ethico-religious one: the essential matter

even in its infancy, is a peculiarity that is inseparable from its character of revelation, and that distinguishes it from all other religions of antiquity. The latter are indeed much more particularistic. They allow, of course, other religions to exist peacefully alongside of themselves, or even, it may be, borrow elements from them. But this toleration results simply from the circumstance that they rest entirely upon a national foundation. Their national gods profess neither the power nor the desire to claim recognition from other peoples as the only gods. It is notoriously only Buddhism which in any degree shares the universalism of the Old Testament religion.

[1] Ps. 9. 17. [2] Isa. 35. 8, Ezra 6. 21 9. 11.
[3] Jer. 10. 25, Ps. 79. 6. [4] Gen. 3. 20.

is that all men — without difference of tribe or nationality—owe their origin to one and the same decree of creation, to one and the same creative act of the Divine will; and that therefore the nobility of human nature, the *essential* relation of humanity to God (the "image of God"), the high destiny of man in the intention of the Creator, that he should rule over the earth and enter on terms of fellowship and intercourse with his God, is something common to them all. The Old Testament itself indicates this ethico-religious kernel with sufficient clearness when, for example, in Gen. 5. 3, cp. ver. 1, in the account of the *first*[1] birth special prominence is given to the truth, that thus the image of God went on to transmit itself, the effect of which is to draw attention to the implication that all men are traceable to the first man, who was created in the image of God; or when, again, Gen. 9. 5 f. expresses the sacredness and inviolability of human life in general, postulating at the same time the fundamental truth that man is created in the image of God; or yet again, when the blood relationship of all men or their derivation from one and the same Creator is made the motive that ought to induce the fulfilment of the duties of mercy and neighbourliness towards inferiors.[2] But if the historical conception of the descent of all human beings from one pair contains this ethico-religious kernel,[3]

[1] *I.e.* according to the *Primitive Document*.

[2] Cp. *e.g.* Isa. 58. 7, Prov. 14. 31, 17. 5, Job 31. 15, etc.

[3] To this kernel let those be referred who are afraid that the combined efforts of philological and historical inquiry on the one hand,

there must have been in the consciousness of the Israelite but a step between it and the perception, that in accordance with its destination all humanity would one day attain the knowledge of the true God, serve Him in His Kingdom, live in His fellowship, and have converse with Him, for only thus could there be fully attained—what the Old Testament everywhere regards as the last end of the creation and history of the world—the honour and glory of God Himself.

To the question, *In what precise way the Kingdom of God would become a universal monarchy, embracing all peoples,* the idea of the covenant supplied an answer. How can the one living God reveal His properly Divine attributes to Israel, and yet fail to attract the notice of the nations whose gods are dead nothings? Shall the fact that the accomplishment of His counsel concerning Israel remains at once the centre-point and the goal of God's government of the world, fail to the last to direct the attention of the Gentiles to what He does in and for His people? How were such a result conceivable in presence of such facts as: that Assyria, with her schemes of conquest, is only an instrument in His hand;[1] or that the mighty Nebuchadnezzar is but

and of physiology on the other, may possibly establish the conclusion that the human race could not have spread itself over the earth from one starting-point. The kernel of ethico-religious truth would remain unaffected by such a result. This full and clear consciousness, moreover, of the unity and homogeneousness of the human race is another of those peculiarities of the Old Testament religion which distinguish it from all the other religions of antiquity.

[1] Isa. 10. 5. 15.

His "servant"[1] to accomplish upon Israel a chastisement ordained by Him and announced long before; or that Cyrus is Jehovah's shepherd, His anointed, the man of His counsel,[2] whom He has raised up for the sake of His servant Israel, and to whose every undertaking He grants success with a view to the accomplishment of His judgments upon the Chaldeans, and the fulfilment of the long-promised redemption of His peculiar people?[3] Even in the Jehovistic portions of the Pentateuch this result of God's acts upon Israel is definitely indicated. Thus in Num. 14. 21 Jehovah swears: "In very deed, as I live, and as all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord,[4] all these men," etc.,—signifying not only that, according to God's will and decree, the glory of Jehovah should one day be manifest to the whole world, but also (as judged by the context) that His vengeance upon the generation led out from Egypt, who had seen His glory and yet had despised and rejected Him (ver. 22), served to carry out that decree. But, besides the part played by this judicial revelation of His glory, a similar purpose, according to other passages, is served by His gracious

[1] Jer. 25. 9, 27. 6, 43. 10. [2] Isa. 44. 28, 45. 1, 46. 11.

[3] Isa. 41. 2, 43. 14, 44. 28, 45. 1. 13.

[4] Knobel's remark on this passage, "He hears the intercessory petition, but swears at the same time *that* the earth shall be filled with His glory," is inaccurate. The subject-matter of the oath, introduced by *ki*, begins to be stated only in ver. 22 f. Bunsen's translation, "And all the world *is* full of the glory of the Eternal," is, however, also wrong, being forbidden by the Imperf. *wᵉyimmālē'*; cp. Ps. 72. 19; and, for the usage to express the present, Isa. 6. 3, Ps. 33. 5, 119. 64. Keil rightly objects to the presential sense in the Numbers passage.

exhibition of His Divine attributes in mercy to His chosen people. We refer particularly to the well-known promise to the patriarchs: "And all peoples (or families) of the earth will *bless themselves* (or be blessed) in (or by) thee (or thy seed)."[1] For even according to the rendering that is supported by the parallels, Gen. 48. 20, Ps. 72. 17,[2] and now generally admitted[3] to be the right one, at least in those passages where the *Hithpa'el* is used,—the rendering, viz., that conveys the sense that all peoples in invoking blessing upon themselves will wish for themselves the blessing that shall have become the recognised property of the patriarchs and their descendants,—the words imply at least that

[1] Gen. 12. 3, 18. 18, 22. 18, 26. 4, 28. 14.

[2] Cp. also Deut. 29. 19, Isa. 65. 16, Jer. 4. 2; and for the opposite (the curse), Num. 5. 21, Isa. 65. 15, Jer. 29. 22, Zech. 8. 13, Ps. 102. 8.

[3] Cp. Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, 2nd ed. i. p. 52. That in the passages, where instead of the *Hithpa'el* the *Niph'al* is used, the promise is to be taken in the different sense, that all peoples, etc., are *to be blessed* through or in Abraham and his seed, as Hengstenberg, Keil (on Gen. 12. 3), and others assume, could, in view of the indisputable fact that the *Niph'al* had originally a reflexive force, in case of need be admitted only in the event of Gustav Baur's (*Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Weissagung*, i. pp. 205 ff.) view proving correct—viz. that the passages, Gen. 22. 18 and 26. 4, are by a *different* author from the other passages—a supposition which, at least as regards Gen. 22. 18, we consider unfounded. But, even granting the supposition, the passive rendering of the *Niph'al* would be, in view of the context, specially that in Gen. 12, improbable. For, apart from the words in Gen. 12. 2, "And be thou a blessing," which are to be explained according to Zech. 8. 13, and which therefore support our interpretation, how can it be supposed probable that, immediately after a promise *to the patriarchs themselves* of a blessing in the form of numerous posterity, victorious dominion over all enemies, and the possession of Canaan, the *spiritual* blessing of a knowledge of the true God proceeding from Israel should be held out prospectively to the *peoples of the earth* (Baur, p. 215)? Even Delitzsch has set his seal to the right rendering (on Gen. 12. 3).

all nations will recognise in the Israelites the "blessed of Jehovah" (Isa. 65. 23), or, more definitely, the people who alone are blessed of their God, who is the *true* God. They imply, therefore, that the grace of God, which displays itself to Israel with its burden of blessing, will attract the regard of all peoples, and awaken in them the longing to participate in the like blessing.[1] The thought that God's deeds of judgment, and especially His deeds of grace and redemption towards Israel, must fill the nations with an astounding admiration and fear of the power of the Living God, is expressed in other parts of the Old Testament—particularly in the prophets—more frequently than in the Pentateuch. It is, in fact, a fundamental thought of prophecy peculiarly appropriate to its character. Why, then, should not the *last* great act of God's grace towards Israel, in which He manifests Himself in the sight of the nations in the fulness of His glory and helpful grace, make an overpowering impression upon them, convince them of the vanity of their idolatry, and of the sole Godhead of Jehovah, and thus bring about the extension of the theocracy among all peoples? How the knowledge of the *prophetic vocation* of Israel, which originated in the idea of the covenant, contributed a fresh light, which revealed the human instrumentality by means of which the nations should be brought into the kingdom of God, has already been indicated above.[2]

[1] Cp. the beginning of the fulfilment of this prophecy in Gen. 26. 28 f.

[2] Cp. my article, "Der Missionsgedanke im Alten Testament," in Dr. Warneck's *Allgem. Missionszeitschrift*, 1880, pp. 453 ff.

Finally, all that comes under the designation of *evil* can have no place in the perfected kingdom of God. For, according to Old Testament belief, evil exists in the world only because of sin—indeed, in the first instance only as its punishment. It is the immediate consequence of the fact, that God conceals His face in wrath. But when in the last days sin has been removed for ever by perfect forgiveness, and fresh defection prevented by the writing of the law of God upon the hearts of His subjects, the power of God, that redeems from evil and is rich in resource, and the salvation and life which accompany His gracious presence, must also be manifested in full measure in the perfected Kingdom. All the misery resulting from sin and God's judgment upon it must have disappeared, that the peace and bliss of the original Paradise may be restored. Hence the features of Messianic prophecy that are borrowed from the familiar pictures of the original condition of the world and humanity: no more sickness;[1] patriarchal longevity;[2] peace among the beasts, as among human nations, and peace between man and beast;[3] the holy land made like the garden of Eden,[4] transformed into it by the wonderful stream that goes forth from the dwelling-place of Jehovah,[5] is laden with blessing, and makes even the waters of the Dead Sea healthful,[6] with the trees of life on its banks, whose never-failing fruits are for food, and its never-

[1] Isa. 33. 24.
[2] Isa. 65. 20, Zech. 8. 4.
[3] Hos. 2. 18, Isa. 11. 6 ff., 65. 25.
[4] Ezek. 36. 35.
[5] Cp. Joel 4. 18, Zech. 14. 8.
[6] Cp. Gen. 2. 10 ff.

fading leaves for healing;[1] finally, the destruction of the power of death itself and the end of all weeping.[2]— Further, as God in His judgments usually shows Himself at the same time also as Lord of Nature, by drawing her into a companionship of suffering with men, for whose sake as well as for the Kingdom of God she exists, thus giving to her also a share in the history of the Theocracy, the perfection of His Kingdom must necessarily be associated with the full display of His creative glory in nature. The great catastrophe accompanying the final judgment, by which the present world is shattered,[3] takes place with a view to the renewal and transfiguration of the world; its result is the new heaven and the new earth.[4]

Yet again,—and to conclude,—let it be carefully noted that all these expectations necessarily tended to disentangle the idea of the Kingdom of God more and more from the conception of the existing national theocracy, and to *prepare the way* for the perception that the perfected Kingdom would be of an *essentially different* kind. Where perfected covenant fellowship is recognised as an inward and personal communion of all individuals with God, which, from its very nature, cannot be confined to any one country or particular place, where it is said *of all flesh* that "they shall come every new moon and every Sabbath to the city of God to worship Jehovah,"[5] but where also it is said, on

[1] Ezek. 47. 1 ff.
[2] Isa. 25. 8; cp. 26. 19, Dan. 12. 2.
[3] Isa. 24. 18 ff., 34. 4, 51. 6.
[4] Cp. Isa. 30. 26, 65. 17, 66. 22. [5] Isa. 66. 23.

the other hand, that every individual in the countries of the nations shall worship Jehovah *from his own place*,[1]—already *there* can there be seen shining through the thin Old Testament veil the idea of a Kingdom of God, which shall be primarily spiritual and heavenly.

III. Germs of individual features of Messianic prophecy lay imbedded *in all the institutions* of the Old Testament theocracy, for at the root of these, as well as of all the precepts of conduct prescribed to Israel, there lay ideas which originate, on the one hand, in the fundamental religious needs of the human heart, and, on the other, in those eternal conditions of communion between the Holy One and sinners, which are founded on the very being of God. As, however, the precise way in which these ideas came to be actually represented and carried out was necessarily determined entirely by the character of the external national theocracy, the arrangements and ordinances of the Old Covenant could offer no real satisfaction to the religious needs of the human heart, and could correspond with the conditions of communion with God only in a very imperfect way. Simultaneously, therefore, with the deepening and spiritualising of religious life, the expectation was necessarily awakened that these arrangements and ordinances would one day be transformed into a shape that would correspond more perfectly with their original idea and intention, or else be replaced by others, and that by an act of God. This is very

[1] Zeph. 2. 11.

specially true of the institution of sacrifice. In the period of prophecy many a godly and enlightened Israelite had come to see how little fit animal-sacrifice was to secure a true atonement for sin, and how, similarly, the washings and other ordinances of cleansing could have no inwardly purifying effect. The announcement, therefore, that God would in some future time effect in another way the expiation of His people's sins[1] met a longing already awake.

Among all the germs of individual features of Messianic prophecy, however, that were imbedded in the Old Testament institutions, none is so important as that contained in the *theocratic kingship*, for it is from it that *Messianic prophecy, in the narrower sense* of the word, grew. Before closing this section,[2] therefore, it is necessary for us to investigate the idea of this institution.[3] Over and above the accounts of the origin of the kingship, the Deuteronomic ordinances relating to the kingly office, the prophecy in 2 Sam. 7, the last words of David in 2 Sam. 23. 1–7, and various scattered references, a number of the psalms shed a special light upon our subject. Of these the most important are Pss. 2, 20, 21, 45, (72), 89, and 110.[4]

[1] Cp. *e.g.* Ezek. 36. 25 ff., Zech. 13. 1. [2] [*I.e.* Part I.—Tr.]

[3] Cp. on this Diestel, "Die Idee des theokratischen Königs," in the *Jahrbb. für deutsche Theologie*, vol. viii. pp. 536 ff., and Oehler's article, "Könige, Königthum in Israel," in Herzog's *Realencyklopädie*.

[4] Decisive *against* the Messianic interpretation of these psalms, and *for* their being referred to definite historical kings (which ones, we need not here ask), are the considerations: *first*, that there is absolutely no proof that the psalmists intended to designate a *future* personage; and *second*, that not a single expression occurs in these psalms that goes

In the theocracy as founded by Moses there was as yet no human kingship. The idea that Jehovah Himself conducted the regimen of His peculiar people, and that all rights of lordship belonged to Him alone, was carried out with the utmost strictness. True, He made use of human organs in the exercise of His kingly rule; Moses himself, his successor Joshua, the judges whom He raised up in times of hostile oppression, were the leaders and guides of His people. But they were not suffered to claim any lordly power or kingly right over the people and land of Jehovah; this was reserved entirely for God Himself. Their position rested solely and entirely upon the fact that they had received a personal commission from the Divine King, in the execution of which they were at every moment entirely dependent upon Him. As in later times the captain of the host stood at the head of all the male citizens who could bear arms, without any surrender on the part of the king either of the lordly power or of the rights peculiar to his office, these commissioned ones stood at the head of the people of God, without either independent power or kingly right. Hence their office was not hereditary, and hence also there was always a possibility that times might recur in which there should be no human leader at the head of the people. Like the prophets, they were *extraordinary organs* of

beyond what, according to the testimony of other passages, might be said, particularly in poetic discourse, of some *present* king. Only Ps. 72 [for this reason bracketed above.—Tr.] will have to be excepted as an echo of the Messianic oracles of the prophets, and be referred, with greatest probability, to the future Messiah.

the Divine King, to be "raised up" only when the condition of the people of God urgently demanded such extraordinary help. The establishment of a human kingship as a stable and lasting institution implied an unmistakable descent from the ideal height of the Mosaic theocracy; it was a *materialising* and *externalising* of the Kingdom. The idea of the Kingship of Jehovah had not taken such a hold upon the hearts of all the citizens as that the occasional raising up of individuals, mighty in the Spirit of the Lord, should have sufficed for the preservation of the theocracy.[1] In consequence of the *actual* ethico-religious condition of the people, the preservation and consolidation of the Kingdom had to seek attainment rather by the external institution of a human regimen than by the spiritual power of the idea of the theocracy. Herein lay a great danger; for the condition and fate of the theocracy thus became in great measure dependent upon the will and conduct of the *one individual* who happened to be actually in possession of the governing power — a dependence which was naturally much greater, and, as a rule, much more dangerous than any which could result from the position of individuals personally called by the Divine King to some extraordinary task. It implied, moreover, a certain actual rivalry to the Kingship of Jehovah, a lowering of His kingly power and

[1] The Song of Deborah (Judg. 5) praises the *mithnaddᵉbhim bā'ām* (those offering themselves among the people, vv. 2 and 9), who gave willing obedience to the summons of Jehovah, but at the same time takes some of the tribes to task for withdrawing themselves from the holy duty of war.

right of possession in His people and land. His hold of the reins of power became, in a certain degree, secondary instead of immediate—a state of affairs that might readily appear irreconcilable with the idea of the Theocracy, inasmuch as the human king presented himself as the nearest possessor of sovereign rights, with power over land and people.

There was, however, another side to the case. The human kingship could hardly be said to be really irreconcilable with the idea of the Theocracy. Only, it must be brought so completely into line with the Divine Kingship, that Jehovah's right of lordship and possession should appear at the same time as that of the king, and *vice versa*. In this view the new institution was not something alien to the organism of the Theocracy, or in contradiction with its idea; it presented itself rather as something that had *grown out of it as from a native germ*.

And if by its erection the Theocracy lost something of its ideal character, there was a counter-balancing gain in the external consolidation, which the actual condition of the public life of Israel demanded. For an experience which dated from the time of the judges had taught that the security and independence of the theocratic people, as over against their neighbours, the closer connexion of the individual tribes with the unity of the national organism, and a prosperous conduct of public affairs in harmony with the will of Jehovah, could be secured only by a powerful and undivided leadership. Some recompense, therefore, for

what the idea of the Divine Kingship had lost of its native force through the relaxation of the ethico-religious spirit of the people might fairly be expected from its embodiment in a permanent external institution. Such a result lay indeed in the path of historical development that began with the institution of a special priesthood; it corresponded to the character of popular religion in Israel in its earliest form (Mosaism), that the idea of the Divine Kingship was as little able as the idea represented in the priesthood to assert itself in permanent practical validity apart from embodiment in a stable external institution. Hence it soon became possible to recognise that such an institution filled up a hitherto existing gap in the organic system of the Theocracy, and that it was an arrangement whose necessity to the existence and future development of His Kingdom God had from the beginning kept in view—always, of course, on the presupposition that the king himself conceived his calling and position in a way conformable to the idea of the Kingdom of God. —Such a conception of the human kingship is apparent in the so-called *Primitive Document* of the Pentateuch, in the promises to the patriarchs that kings should come out of their loins;[1] it meets us in the oracles of Balaam, according to which the glory proper to the people of God culminates in the kingship, in particular, in the star that should arise out of Jacob.[2] On the other hand, in the traditions relating to the origin of the kingship we are confronted with two different

[1] Gen. 17. 6. 16, 35. 11. [2] Num. 23. 21, 24. 7. 17.

points of view which appear in sharp contrast. According to the one,[1] Samuel is still entirely of the mind of Gideon[2] in his view of the inconsistency of the human with the Divine kingship. He acquiesces in the people's desire for a king, originating as it did solely in the perception of the accession of force which their heathen neighbours owed to the institution of royalty, only after a prolonged resistance and in obedience to a special indication of the Divine will, but continues to recognise in it a serious offence against the rights of Jehovah, a rejection of Him as the King of the Theocracy; only reluctantly does he desist from the effort to maintain the Divine State in its old strict form, which excluded all human kingship. According to the other tradition,[3] on the contrary, Samuel himself, as a prophet commissioned by God, called the new institution into being, without being forced to it by the people. The question, which of the two accounts is more in accordance with the facts that actually led to the elevation of Saul to the kingly dignity, may here be waived. It is, however, historically most probable that the human kingship was not all at once generally recognised as an institution which fitted into the organism of the Theocracy, and that the grounds of this initial opposition were able subsequently to claim a fresh validity in view of the evils which experience proved to be connected with it.[4]

[1] 1 Sam. 8, 10. 17–11. 15; cp. chap. 12. [2] Judg. 8. 23.

[3] 1 Sam. 9–10. 16.

[4] The historical criticism, which has proceeded on the lines of Vatke (*Biblische Theologie*, pp. 260 ff.; cp. esp. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*

At all events, during the reign of Saul, whose government, more *auto*cratic than *theo*cratic, represented, not so much the unity as rather the still unreconciled contrast of the human and the Divine kingship, and who soon found himself in fierce conflict with the existing representatives of theocratic power, with prophecy in the person of Samuel, and with the priesthood (witness the massacre at Nob!), it was impossible that the conception of the human kingship as an embodiment of the idea of the Theocracy could take firm root in the common consciousness, still less develop itself in detail. This could happen only when David, a man after God's own heart,[1] sat on the throne; when in him the kingship was placed in the right relation to the other organs of the Theocracy, especially to the prophets,—the relation, viz., that was demanded by the idea of the Kingdom of God. Then, for the first time, prophecy itself, in the oracle of Nathan, announces as a Divine decree the *hereditary nature* of the kingship; the election of David *and his family* permanently associates the idea of the theocratic kingship in the closest possible way with the house of David, and, as thus associated, it becomes henceforward more and more an integral moment in the conception of the Kingdom of God. The last words of David[2] testify to the early date of the expectation, founded upon the promise of the eternal covenant with the house of David,[3] that right-

etc., pp. 265 ff.), insists, of course, that the opposition between the Divine and the human kingship orginated with the Judaism of the Exile, or later.

[1] 1 Sam. 13. 14.

[2] 2 Sam. 23. 1–7, esp. ver. 5.

[3] 2 Sam. 7. 16.

eous and God-fearing rulers should proceed from the Davidic stock, and that with them the light of salvation should arise in full brilliancy upon the kingdom of God, and a condition of rich blessing and joyous prosperity be brought about. With the prophets, however, the view that the Divine Kingship is in no way hindered or limited, but rather fully realised, through the Davidic, is absolutely predominant;[1] and their attitude reveals the fruitful germs of fresh insight into the saving purpose of God that were implanted in the consciousness of Israel along with the idea of the theocratic kingship.

Let us examine more minutely what this idea carried with it. In doing so we may, without scruple, adduce the utterances of the later and the latest Old Testament writings, inasmuch as they are merely developments from germs native to the idea.

The thought underlying the process by which, for the consciousness of Israel, the human and the Divine kingship were brought completely into line with each other was, that the theocratic king, as the "anointed of Jehovah,"[2] and as the one *chosen* by God,[3] and set up in His house and kingdom,[4] is the *visible representative of the invisible God-King.* As the vicar of God on

[1] Even Hosea forms in this respect no exception (ep. 3. 5); his condemnation of the kingship of the ten tribes (8. 4, 10. 3, 13. 10 f.) cannot be made to refer to human kingship in general (*contra* König in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 340 ff.).

[2] Cp. *e.g.* Ps. 89. 20.

[3] Cp. in contrast with Hos. 8. 4: Deut. 17. 15, 1 Sam. 10. 24, 16. 8. 10, 2 Sam. 6. 21, 1 Kings 8. 16, 11. 34, Ps. 78. 70, etc.

[4] 1 Chron. 17. 14.

earth, he is the human organ by means of which Jehovah exercises His government over His people. His kingship is not merely by God's grace, but also in God's stead; his dignity and kingly glory is not only something granted by God, it is also the earthly antitype of the glory and majesty of God Himself.[1] On the basis of this conception of the relation between the earthly and the heavenly king, the two are often named together, and side by side, in order to give complete expression to the *one* idea of the theocratic government.[2] Hence, further, the covenant, which the high priest Jehoiada concludes between Jehovah on the one hand and the king and the people on the other,—viz. that they should be a people of Jehovah,—is at the same time a covenant between the king and the people.[3] Rebellion against the king is at the same time rebellion against Jehovah Himself.[4] Later writers go so far as to say that the king "sits upon the throne of the Kingdom of Jehovah," or even that he sits "upon the throne of Jehovah."[5] Hence it is not surprising that even in earlier times similar expressions were used by *poets*. Thus, for instance, the poet of Ps. 45 calls the king's throne the *throne of God* (ver. 6).[6] Similarly, according to Ps. 110. 1, God said

[1] Cp. Ps. 21. 5, 45. 3, with Ps. 96. 6, 104. 1, 111. 3.

[2] Cp. *e.g.* Prov. 24. 21, Hos. 3. 5; also 1 Sam. 12. 3. 5.

[3] 2 Kings 11. 17.

[4] Cp. Ps. 2. 2; also Prov. 24. 21 and Isa. 8. 6.

[5] 1 Chron. 28. 5, 29. 23.

[6] The rendering of *kis'ākhā 'Ĕlohim*, "thy God-throne," seems after all the simplest; there is no objection to it on the score of grammar

to the king: "Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool," which, strictly speaking, does not imply so much as the expressions previously cited; for, besides the first rank and the highest honour next to God Himself,[1] it ascribes to the king properly, only the highest degree of *participation in* the sovereignty of God—not, however, the representation of the invisible King Himself.[2] By his being appointed the organ through whom the heavenly King conducts the government of His people, the foundation is laid of an *altogether peculiar* and close relation of fellowship between God and the king—a relation expressed in the fact that Jehovah is called his *father*, and the king Jehovah's *son*. This designation belongs solely to him, not even to the priest or the prophet—or any other individual Israelite. It is applied, *besides*, only to Jehovah's peculiar people as a whole, and to them only on the similar ground of the election. As, therefore, Israel was among the nations, so was the theocratic king among the Israelites, in respect of the altogether unique relation to God. The God-sonship of the entire nation culminates in the king's personal sonship, just as Israel's holiness and priestly character culminate in

(cp. Hupfeld on Ps. 45. 6). It is hard to see why *'ōlām wa'ĕdh* cannot be as good a predicate as *l'ōlām wa'ĕdh* (Lam. 5. 19), or as *l'ōlām* (*contra* Ewald and Hitzig). In other cases surely, according to Ewald himself, a substantive can stand as predicate in place of an adjective (cp. Ewald, § 296*b*). There would, however, be no material difference even were we to translate with Ewald, Hitzig, and others, "Thy throne is (a throne) of God for ever and ever."

[1] Cp. 1 Kings 2. 19, Ps. 45. 9. 12, 1 Macc. 10. 62 f., Matt. 20. 20 ff.

[2] The explanation of Ewald—favoured also by Diestel (in *loc. cit.* pp. 563 f.)—which requires us to interpret the sitting at the right

the high priest; in the one case as in the other, that which in virtue of the Divine election belongs to the nation as a whole, is summarised and intensified in the person of one individual, who is the object of special Divine election. The immediate proof of God's fatherly relation to the king lies in the fact that He shows him special paternal love and care, takes him under His protection as a sanctified and inviolable person,[1] and exercises towards him all the careful discipline of a father; while the king, as Jehovah's son, relies confidently upon his God, and upon the rock of his salvation; yet is, at the same time, bound to childlike obedience.[2] If he fail of such obedience,[3] God chastises him, but does not reject him or his house. As for Abraham's sake He never issues a warrant of destruction against Israel, but always gives him fresh proof of His grace; so for David's sake he never suffers His grace to depart from the king, nor his house to perish.[4]

hand of the position of the king in the victorious war-chariot, on which God and the king go out to battle (cp. Ps. 44. 9, 2 Sam. 5. 24) is certainly incorrect. The analogous utterance, ver. 4, shows clearly that the reference is to what the king of the theocracy *as such is*, not to any special Divine assistance in war. How little we are at liberty to take the details of the picture presented in the following verses (which actually do describe the king's going forth to war) with absolute literalness—forgetful of the character of poetic discourse—appears at once from ver. 5, where the relations are reversed, and Jehovah is at the right hand of the king. On the meaning of the *adh* (until), however, cp. *e.g.* Gen. 28. 15.

[1] Cp. 1 Sam. 24. 7. 11, 26. 9 f., 2 Sam. 1. 14.

[2] Cp. 2 Sam. 7. 14, 1 Chron. 22. 10 f., 28. 6, Ps. 89. 26 ff.

[3] Cp. 1 Kings 9. 4 f., 1 Chron. 28. 7.

[4] 2 Sam. 7. 14 f., Ps. 89. 28. Diestel, in *loc. cit.* p. 559, refers appropriately to the historical illustration of this idea in 1 Kings 15. 4 f., 2 Kings 8. 19. It is, in fact, one of the ideas which determines

—But just as God's fatherly relation to Israel implies that, as his Creator and Maker, He has made Israel what he is,—an independent people and the people of God,[1]—so there is implied in the designation of God, as father of the theocratic king, that his kingship originates from God, and rests upon a transference to him of God's own kingly power.[2]

As the organ of Jehovah's kingly government of His people, the first business of the theocratic king is to defend the kingdom of God against the attacks of heathen peoples, and secure its prestige and power beyond its own border, that the people of God may dwell in peace and safety, and take among the peoples of the earth the position that becomes them. He delivers them from the power of their enemies,[3] accomplishes the punishment ordained by Jehovah against nations who have wronged His kingdom and people,[4] and, in general, conducts the wars of Jehovah.[5] For such an exercise of the duties of his calling he is fitted

the pragmatism of history-writing in the Books of Kings. Besides the above passages, cp. 1 Kings 11. 12 f. 32. 36. 39, 2 Kings 19. 34, 20. 6, and the close of the book.

[1] Deut. 32. 6, Isa. 43. 1. 15, 45. 11.

[2] Cp. Ps. 2. 7. From what we have noted above regarding the relation of the kingly dignity to that which belongs to the whole people, the reason of the ascription by the "Great Unknown" (Isa. 55. 3 ff.) of the *chaṣ'dhē Dhāvidh hannĕ'ĕmānim* (sure mercies of David), as well as of the priesthood to the people of God, as a whole becomes intelligible. According to his representation there is in the perfect time no longer either a special priesthood or a special kingship. The election of the entire people is brought up to the level of the election that had hitherto been the privilege of priest and king.

[3] 1 Sam. 9. 16, 2 Sam. 3. 18. [4] 1 Sam. 15. [5] 1 Sam. 25. 28.

by the almighty power of God. Jehovah girds him with power, endues him with the warrior's courage and hardihood, and gives him success in all his undertakings.[1] He Himself supports him with the ready help of His right hand (Ps. 20. 6); His hand is ever with him, and His arm strengthens him; He "beats down" his adversaries before him (Ps. 89. 21 ff.), and makes all his enemies his footstool. Thus in the power of his God, the king overcomes and subjects or else annihilates all enemies of the kingdom.[2]

In relation, similarly, to the internal conditions and circumstances of the theocracy, the king is the executor of the royal will of Jehovah; his *judicial* activity secures the maintenance of justice, and the authority of the law in the kingdom of God: he punishes every rebellion against the will of God, crushes the insolence of the violent, helps the poor and the needy to their rights, preserves thus order and peace, and is to the land as refreshing rain; under his government the righteous spring forth and blossom.[3] It is also part of his office to see to it that the people keep faith with their God, honour Him, serve Him; it is his duty to put down and punish all idolatry, invocation of the dead, worship at high places, and the like,[4] and, in general, to be the principal overseer, manager, and leader in all matters pertaining to worship.[5] He has

[1] Ps. 18. 29–43, 2 Kings 18. 7.
[2] Ps. 2. 8 f., 21. 8 ff., 45. 4 f.
[3] Prov. 16. 12–15, 20. 8. 26; cp. Ps. 72. 1–7. 12–15.
[4] Cp. 1 Sam. 28. 3. 9, 2 Kings 18. 4 ff., 23. 4 ff.
[5] 2 Sam. 6, 2 Kings 12. 5 ff.

thus to labour to secure that the will of God should be in every particular recognised and accomplished in His own kingdom. And for this side also of his appointed task he is furnished by God with special gifts of government, as, *e.g.*, Solomon was qualified to exercise the office of judge through the wisdom granted to him.[1] It is clear from all this that, by the exercise of his royal functions in war and in peace, abroad and at home, the king became *the mediator through whom Jehovah imparted help, salvation, and blessing to His people.*

It is, of course, to be understood that the whole content of the idea of the theocratic kingship, as we have hitherto developed it, rests on the supposition that the king himself is really possessed of the disposition, imperative in a representative of the invisible King, that he honours God, to Whose undeserved grace he owes all his dignity, in deep humility,[2] trusts Him implicitly, and offers Him joyful thanks for His help;[3] that he loves righteousness and hates unrighteousness,[4] being like God Himself in his intolerance of wicked men near to his person or among his servants, and that he accepts in all earnestness the trust to secure that the ordinances of justice be maintained in his kingdom, and the theocracy become in truth—what it is intended to be—a kingdom of righteousness and peace;[5] in short, that *his royal will become, through his willing and complete obedience*

[1] 1 Kings 3. 4 ff.; cp. 2 Sam. 14. 17. 20, 19. 27.
[2] Cp. 2 Sam. 6. 21 f.
[3] Cp. *e.g.* Ps. 21. 1. 7.
[4] Ps. 45. 4. 6 f.
[5] Ps. 101.

to Jehovah, one with the will of the invisible King. The will of God is made known to him partly from the law,[1] partly through the prophets, whose duty it is, in the event of his disobedience, to bring his sin home to him, and to threaten him with God's judgment. The ideal theocratic king, however, is one who has been so changed in heart by the Spirit of God, and so fitted for the service of Jehovah, that he is himself inwardly impelled to do what God wills should be done through him.[2]

As the theocratic king is the representative of Jehovah, whose dominion extends over all lands and peoples, and who will one day be known and acknowledged by all peoples as God and King, it is only a necessary consequence of the position and dignity assigned him by God, that he should be the first and the greatest among the kings of the earth,[3] and that *his dominion should be an unlimited one;* it is ordained that all kings pay him homage and all peoples serve him, and one day they will actually do so; he must rule from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth, for God is ready to give him what belongs by full right to His son; and what the Almighty wills, He also gloriously carries out.[4]—As, finally, the throne

[1] Cp. Ps. 18. 22 f., 2 Kings 11. 12, Deut. 17. 18.

[2] Cp. 1 Sam. 10. 6 f. 9, 16. 13. [3] Ps. 89. 27.

[4] Ps. 2. 8, 72. 8–11, 89. 25; cp. Ps. 18. 44–46 and 2 Chron. 32. 23. Diestel (in *loc. cit.* pp. 570 ff.) is right in drawing attention to the fact that it is impossible to estimate aright the significance which the Israelites attached to the idea of a world-dominion, unless we realise, *on the one hand,* their *limited* geographical horizon, and, *on the other,* the *very loose* relation of dependence in which, in Anterior Asia,

of God endures *for ever*,[1] so also the throne of the theocratic king; the Kingdom of God, over which he is placed, is an everlasting Kingdom, whose kingship is granted to him *for ever*, because of the election of David, from which Jehovah cannot go back. This, of course, does not imply the eternal longevity of the individual king,—although in poetic hyperbole even this is assigned him,[2] as in court-language it is wished to him,[3]—but only that the kingship is the *property of his house*,[4] and in that sense the eternal possession even of the individual—the same sense, viz., in which the priesthood of Aaron and his sons is an eternal priesthood.[5]

Hitherto we have regarded the king as the representative of the invisible Divine King. But as standing at their head, the king is also the natural representative *of the people*. He is so to God as well as to other peoples and kings. And as this people, in virtue of their election, are a people of priests,[6] so to him, in virtue of his special election, in which that of the

dominion over outlying peoples usually consisted.—The dress in which the fancy of the Israelites necessarily clothed it must not, however, allow us to forget the *thoroughly ideal character* of the conception. The picture, moreover, in which the Israelite, basing upon his limited geographical horizon, and following the political ideas of his time, might portray the world-dominion of the king who reigned in God's stead, was one after all of very indefinite outline—as indeed, considering the nature of such ideal conceptions, it behoved to be. The Germano-Roman empire presents, at least in its time of bloom, a notorious analogy to the theocratic kingdom of the Israelites: in the idea of both world-dominion is an integral moment.

[1] Ps. 45. 6. [2] Ps. 21. 4. [3] 1 Kings 1. 31.
[4] 2 Sam. 7. 12–16. 29, 1 Kings 9. 5, 1 Chron. 28. 4, Ps. 89. 28 f. 36 f.
[5] Cp. Ex. 40. 15, Num. 25. 13. [6] Ex. 19. 6.

people culminates, there must be assigned the highest degree of priestly dignity. The Theocratic Kingdom must be—according to its idea—*a Kingdom of Priests.* History testifies, further, that the kings regarded themselves as the chief trustees of the priestly function, even though in all probability they did not usurp the *elder* privilege of the house of Aaron to exercise the priestly rights and duties pertaining to the *sanctuary,* in particular, the ritual of *sacrifice ;* or, if they did so, as according to the Chronicles Uzziah did,[1] they met with the most pronounced opposition.[2] In the festive fetching of the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem, David not only wears the priestly dress, the linen ephod,[3] but he dispenses to the people the priestly blessing,[4] and deems himself warranted in transferring the high priestly office to Zadok and Abiathar. Solomon, too, imparts to the people the priestly blessing,[5] ordains a religious feast,[6] and deposes one high priest to install another.[7] That, in general, the king bore the principal part, by way of oversight and management, in all the ceremonies of religion and worship, has already been noted above. Even Uzziah's offering of the incense requires us to suppose that a special priestly dignity was actually conceded to him ; finally, because the king, as head of the people, is their representative before God,

[1] 2 Chron. 26. 16 ff.

[2] On the passages which seem to assign to the Davidic kings the management of matters pertaining to the priesthood, cp. art. "Priester" in the *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Alterthums,* p. 1222, edited by me.

[3] 2 Sam. 6. 14 ; cp. 1 Sam. 22. 18. [4] 2 Sam. 6. 16 ff.

[5] 1 Kings 8. 14. 55. [6] Ver. 65. [7] 1 Kings 2. 26 f.

they share the punishment of his sin;[1] just as for an error of the high priest, or of the priesthood in general, the wrath of God strikes the whole community.[2]—Hence it cannot surprise us that in Ps. 110. 4 we should read of a sworn promise of God to the king, appointing him a *priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek*,—an utterance which we may have all the less scruple in referring to the king actually in office in the time of the poet, that the addition "after the order of Melchisedek" expressly forbids us to think of the special rights and duties of the Aaronic high priest, particularly the mediatorial function in the offering of sacrifice; for of Melchisedek tradition relates only that he *blessed* Abraham, and received from him the *tithes;* it does not say that he offered sacrifices: it ascribes to him, that is to say, only those priestly actions which by the express testimony of history both David and Solomon performed.

Such in its essential features is the idea of the Theocratic Kingship. Manifestly it includes such lofty conceptions and awakens such lofty expectations, that here also historic reality necessarily lagged far behind the idea. In the early days of the kingdom under the house of David, when as yet, for the most part, good energetic rulers, well disposed to the Theocracy, sat on the throne (David, Solomon, Asa, Jehoshaphat), general contentment with the measure in which the idea had attained realisation was—apart from the disruption of

[1] Cp. *e.g.* 2 Sam. 21. 1 ff., 24. 1 ff., 2 Kings 23. 26 f., 24. 3 f.
[2] Cp. *e.g.* Lev. 10. 6.

the ten tribes—possible. In this time and even later, when kings of the like character adorned the throne, it was possible for poets to refer the contents of the idea of the Theocratic Kingship to the contemporary sovereign, and thus always the more fully to unfold these contents themselves and implant them in the consciousness of the people. For it is of the very essence of poetry to transcend the limits of empirical reality with its imperfections and deficiencies, and so to regard and present it as it appears to the eye of the inspired enthusiast—*i.e.* as penetrated and transfigured by the light of the idea.[1]—It was natural also that, so long as the memory of the magnificent period of the reigns of David and Solomon remained fresh, the eyes of those who found the contemporary kingship in contradiction with their cherished ideal should still turn to the fair and brilliant days of the *past*. The farther, however, these palmy days of the kingdom receded into the distant past, the more frequently the experience recurred of a glaring contradiction between reality and ideal, through the presence on the throne of weak and unrighteous kings, who were unfaithful to the pure Jehovah-religion; and the more psalmody contributed to present the idea of the Theocratic Kingship in all the fulness of its wealth and glory,[2] the more proportionately did this idea inevitably direct the eyes of godly Israelites to the *future*—the more, *i.e.*, did it become certain to them that the true King of the Theocracy

[1] Hence the typico-Messianic psalms.

[2] Cp. DIESTEL in *loc. cit.* pp. 548, 578, 587.

could not belong to the present, with its conditions and circumstances, at all, but was to be expected only in the "last days," for then only would the whole Kingdom of God attain completion. There grew thus from the idea of the Theocratic Kingship the *prophecy of the Messianic king*, who, owing to the fact that this idea was in its earliest origin indissolubly associated with the kingship of the house of David, was designated an offspring from the stock of David, and was characterised as the perfect human organ by means of whom the invisible King conducts the government of His people. All that is great in the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah regarding the future Messiah is only the unfolding of the germs contained in the idea of the Theocratic Kingship; with these prophets, however, the germs have already attained their full development, except that the element of priestly dignity appears in its final definiteness only in the later conceptions of the Messianic king.[1]

We have thus shown that Messianic prophecy is to be regarded as being in its main features the organic development of germs which the Old Testament religion from the first carried in its bosom. The same is true of the individual Messianic passages. They contain no new features which cannot be shown to stand in some sort of organic or genetic connexion with those already existing, or which, consequently, the Spirit of God might not have wrought in the spirit of the prophet through a normal psychological medium. No-

[1] Jer. 30. 21; cp. Zech. 3 and 6.

where do we find anything that is not essentially conditioned and determined by an accompanying germination of the Old Testament faith.

We are certain that, in so saying, we do not miss the truth that a prophecy was never produced by the will of man, but rather that "holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."[1] The objective reality of a revelation is not impaired by the fact that the revealing operations of the Divine Spirit proceed always within the laws of man's spiritual life; neither is it impaired by a candid acknowledgment of the conditioning and determining influence exercised upon a prophet's revealed message by the prior elements of his consciousness. Without the continuous revealing and enlightening operation of the Spirit of God, the development of Messianic prophecy from the Old Testament creed would have been impossible. No germ becomes a plant apart from the presence of the outward conditions suitable to its development; yet for all that the growth is organic—something proceeding from within outwards. So also prophecy does not grow apart from the revealing activity of the Spirit of God; yet its development also is from within outwards —it starts, *i.e.*, from what is already within the mind of the prophet. And even if prophecy *is*, as we affirm, but an unfolding of germs native to the Old Testament faith, yet, just because this unfolding is not accomplished simply by the exercise of the prophet's own understanding and reason, but by the *special* revealing

[1] 2 Pet. 1. 21.

activity of the Spirit of God, the *prophetic consciousness runs, in the process, far in advance of the ordinary development—through the slow human process of history —of the religious consciousness of Israel, gives it line and goal, and thus secures it against the delays resulting from the errors, stoppages, and retrogressions which are the invariable accompaniments of a course of historical development.* Only he who has lost faith in the *living* God can suppose that what presents itself to one point of view as the product of ordinary historical development cannot be the result of a personal operation of the transcendent God, Who continuously intervenes in that ordinary process with imperative and decisive effect. But he who knows the living God, recognising always in history the hand of Him Who holds the reins of Universal Government, will never fail similarly to recognise in the development of religious truth the revealing activity of that God Whose light alone can illumine our darkness.

SECOND PART.

THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY: ITS ADAPTATION TO THE TIMES.

MESSIANIC prophecy is an *essential constituent* of prophetic discourse. For it was the task of the prophets to aim steadily at the result of Israel's becoming more and more in reality what, by the electing grace of God, he was ideally and by destination—a holy and priestly people, the peculiar possession of Jehovah, occupying a position of substantial communion with his God. For the fulfilment of this task it was imperative that the belief in the glorious goal of Israel's history, established on the one hand by the unalterable decree of God, and contradicted on the other by the misery of the present, should be ever and anon freshly and victoriously reaffirmed, that the consciousness of their great destiny might be kept alive among the people, and developed with increasing clearness and completeness. Hence none of the prophets neglects to point to the end of the ways of God. Even Amos, for instance, though he appears before the people chiefly as a preacher of vengeance and as the herald of a judgment already on the way, must, at least in the end, hold out to the godly and repentant the

winning prospect of the salvation of the perfect time. And so throughout we find in all the prophetic writings —even the most insignificant—at least something in the shape of a Messianic oracle.

In its most general and essential features, moreover, Messianic prophecy is the same at all times and with all the prophets. God's judgment upon His unfaithful people, with a view to their chastisement, purification, and sifting; the conversion of the people—or at least a remnant of them—to their God; judgment upon the heathen peoples,—into whose power Israel had been delivered, and who had insolently transgressed the limits of their commission and sought the total destruction of the kingdom of God; the redemption of the people of God; and, finally, the spiritual salvation and the external blessing of the accomplished covenant-communion of Israel with his God, living among His people and by His kingly government creating righteousness and peace in His Kingdom,—such are everywhere the main features of the picture which the prophets draw of the historical course of the Kingdom of God to its goal of perfection. The *details* of the picture, however, vary very considerably with the times and with the prophets. At one time the prominent feature in the Messianic delineation is external, earthly prosperity—the power and prestige of the people of God, security against enemies, the wonderful fruitfulness of the holy land, etc.; at another, prominence is given to spiritual salvation—the forgiveness of sins, the ethico-religious renewal of the people by the out-

pouring of the Spirit of God, the intimate communion of life and love which every individual will enjoy with God. In one place the blessing is promised *exclusively* —to Israel alone; in another the promise is *universal* —to all peoples. One prophet ascribes the accomplishment of the salvation of the perfect time solely to Jehovah Himself, another connects the dawn of the Messianic time with the appearance of the Messianic king, while a third represents the true people of God as the organ used by Him to carry out effectually His decree of grace. The perfected Kingdom appears *now* as one that corresponds with the existing Old Testament economy—it has its central sanctuary in the temple at Jerusalem, its special priesthood, its ritual of sacrifice, including even sacrifices of propitiation, etc.; *now* it is represented as something very different from the old *régime*, for the special theocratic offices are declared superfluous, and in consequence the old classification of the people and the old form of worship call for renewal.—A much larger element of variation in the form of Messianic prophecy owes its origin, however, to the constant changing of the features borrowed from contemporary history. In one place, for instance, it is sufficient that Israel should be secured against the attacks of neighbouring peoples; in another, the oppressive yoke of the Assyrians must be shattered; in yet another, the Chaldean world-empire must be destroyed, God's people brought back from the land of captivity to the holy land, and Jerusalem and the temple rebuilt, that the promised era of salvation may

begin. Indeed, nearly every picture of the Messianic time has its special colouring, borrowed from contemporary events.

This variety in the shaping of Messianic prophecy is due in part to the mental peculiarities of individual prophets, and to their particular religious standpoints; in part also it results from the *gradual* character of the process by which God's saving purpose is revealed. But by far the most important reason is to be sought in the qualifying and determining influence exercised upon the Messianic oracles of the individual prophet by the *historical conditions and circumstances of the immediate and ever-varying present.*

The *first* point needs no detailed explanation. No one will deny that even in the sphere of Messianic prophecy the differences of individual prophets in character, gifts, disposition, experience, progressive development, make themselves felt. These differences, it will be allowed, affect such points as the tone and setting of the discourse, the choice of pictures, the predominance of the verbal or the visionary method of revelation, the natural simplicity or the richly-significant play of symbolism that surprises the reader, the plain, concise presentation of the vision or its artistic and detailed description, the now larger and the now lesser width of horizon, and the like. We have, however, spoken of differences in religious standpoint, and on this one point a word of explanation may be necessary to guard ourselves against misapprehension. We do not, of course, mean any difference that would com-

promise unity of spirit: all the prophets start from the same fundamental convictions, all have in view the same goal. We are surely warranted, however, in asserting that, quite apart from this spiritual unity that everywhere attests itself, individual prophets differ from one another in the *attitude* they assume to the *law* and the institutions of the Old Testament theocracy. All of them, indeed, take up a position that is neither outside of nor above the law, but in its centre, for they intrench themselves in its inmost essence;[1] but upon this standing-ground common to them all a difference was nevertheless possible in the value they might severally assign to what constitutes the circumference of the law; the external precepts could assume for one a greater, for another a less significance. Thus frequently—especially in the elder prophecy—this circumference or *periphery* of the law remains totally disregarded, and the entire emphasis is laid upon its ethico-religious kernel. In reading an Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, or Micah, one might easily suppose that they would not have conceded any religious importance to the ceremonial of worship or to any ritual precepts whatsoever.[2] How wholly different, on the other hand, the attitude of Ezekiel! Passages such as Ezek.

[1] We do not use the word "law" here as synonymous with "law-book" or even with "Pentateuch;" at least with the older prophets the law is still essentially a matter of oral tradition and announcement.

[2] That this, however, is not the case SMEND has shown in detail in his dissertation, *Moses apud prophetas* (cp. pp. 37 ff., 66 ff.), and in his treatise, "Ueber die von den Propheten des achten Jahrhunderts vorausgesetzte Entwickelungsstufe der israelitischen Religion," in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1876, 4 Hft., esp. pp. 656 ff.

4. 14, 22. 26 show the great importance that the regulations regarding meats and purifications have for him. And that this is not to be accounted for by the later date of Ezekiel, but is to be regarded as a result of his peculiar religious standpoint, is proved by a glance at his contemporary Jeremiah, who has in common with him only the emphatic insistance upon the Sabbatic commandment,[1] but in other respects shares the attitude of the older prophets to the ceremonial precepts. That such a difference of religious view would necessarily make itself felt in the separate utterances of Messianic prophecy, must be already apparent to any one who followed our remarks on the mode of revelation to the prophets (pp. 54 ff.). Though it is true that the eternal thoughts of God, which attain accomplishment in the New Covenant, *nowhere entirely* free themselves from their specific Old Testament investiture, this envelopment will, nevertheless, as a matter of course, be more observable in the utterances of those prophets who lay more stress than others upon the Old Testament precepts and institutions. And such is actually the case, *e.g.*, with Ezekiel. His contemporary Jeremiah may, in the delineation of the Messianic time, make *incidental* reference to temple, priests, and offerings;[2] but his prophecy culminates in the assertion that the perfected Kingdom of God is one in which there shall be no ark, no law written upon tables of stone, no unapproachable Holy

[1] Jer. 17. 19 ff.; cp. Ezek. 20. 12 ff., 22. 8.
[2] Jer. 17. 26, 31. 14, 33. 11, 18. 18 ff.

of Holies, no difference between priests and laity, between prophets and people—in which, rather, Jehovah's presence shall pervade the entire City of God, the law be written upon the hearts of all, and all alike shall know God, and stand in the same close relation to Him.[1] There is nothing, on the other hand, so characteristic of Ezekiel's prophecy as the fact that he cannot present to himself even the spiritualised religious life of God's people in the perfect time apart from its embodiment in the conventional forms. The picture he draws of the perfected Kingdom is substantially the picture of the old theocracy; only, many of the arrangements of the latter undergo a perfecting transformation, in describing which Ezekiel deems the external arrangements and ordinances of the renewed theocracy of such importance that he details even the smallest particulars with the utmost minuteness.[2] In chaps. 40–48 we read that in the new temple even sin-offerings and guilt-offerings are still offered,[3] and that on the first and seventh days of the first month there is to be performed an annually recurring atonement for the sanctuary;[4] the line of demarcation between priests and laity is drawn even more straightly than in the law;[5] the legal definitions as to the holy and the unholy, the clean and the unclean, remain in force, and the people are, as formerly, instructed in them by the priests;[6] circumcision of the heart is

[1] Jer. 3. 16 f., 31. 29 ff.
[2] Ezek. chaps. 40–48.
[3] Ezek. 40. 39, 42. 13, 44. 29, 46. 20.
[4] Ezek. 45. 18 ff.
[5] Ezek. 44. 19.
[6] *Id.* ver. 23.

associated with circumcision of the flesh.[1] In short, the mark of the perfect time is not the abolition of the old or a total renewal, it is rather such a filling of the old forms with the spirit, without which they are dead and worthless, as that the reality or substance always accompanies the external symbol, and that with the ceremony there is always associated the disposition of spirit it is meant to embody. Ezekiel occupies thus undeniably, even in his Messianic prophesying, the priestly standpoint much more than Jeremiah; even *here* the great importance of the ceremonial precepts in his religious consciousness is manifest. Similarly, it might be shown from other instances how the greater or less depth of religious life, and the measure of ethico-religious perception, peculiar to the prophets severally, exercise a determining influence upon their Messianic utterances. Compare, *e.g.*,—to put the factors of the greatest contrast side by side,—the prophecies of the second half of Isaiah with those of a Haggai or a Malachi!

As to the *second* ground of variety in the form of Messianic prophecy, viz. the gradually progressive nature of the revelation of God's saving purpose to the prophets, the minute treatment of it belongs properly to a history of the development of revelation. Such a history has to show how the true character of the perfected Theocracy, and the ways and means of its accomplishment, come to be recognised by the prophets with ever-increasing clearness and completeness. Such a presentation of the historical development of pro-

[1] Ezek. 44. 9.

phecy we do not here contemplate,[1] and we annex the remarks it may be suitable for us to make in this connexion to our illustration of the *third* point, viz. the qualifying and determining influence which the historical conditions and circumstances of the immediate and ever-varying present exercise upon the content of Messianic prophecy. We mean that the progressive development of Messianic prophecy stands in a genetic and teleological connexion with the historical course of the Old Testament theocracy—a *genetic* connexion because of the influence, just referred to, which varying historical circumstances exercise upon it; a *teleological*, because history, like prophecy, is designed to be a preparation and education of Israel for the fulfilment of his calling, and for the reception of the Messianic salvation; hence history and prophecy must, if they are to coöperate towards the attainment of their common goal, in their course of development run parallel and keep step with each other. The proof of the influence exercised upon Messianic prophecy by changing historical circumstances will thus of necessity contain many indicative allusions to the gradually progressive character of the knowledge of God's saving purpose. Accordingly we take for the subject of our investigation in this Second Part, *The Historical Character of Messianic Prophecy: its Adaptation to the Times.*[2] In

[1] An attempt in this direction, in many respects successful, is to be found in the second principal part of the work of VON ORELLI cited above; cp., nevertheless, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1883, pp. 812 ff.

[2] [The German is simply *Der zeitgeschichtliche Charakter der messianischen Weissagung.* Our *historical* can hardly be accepted as a

treating this subject we shall *first* bring into focus the features, lying to our hand, in the delineation of the Messianic era that are obviously borrowed from the times, and *then* endeavour to exhibit the deeper-lying genetic connexion between the history and the prophecy.

I. In regard then to this *times-colouring*, which at once strikes the student as characterising all Messianic prophecy, we have nothing substantially new to add to what has been already elaborated by BERTHEAU,[1] and it is only because nothing is so essential to a knowledge of the true historical character of prophecy as a proper estimate, such as is as yet by no means common, of the concrete features which it owes to contemporary history, that we do not feel at liberty to rid ourselves of the obligation to offer some explanation of this subject.

The prophet is first and foremost the trustee of a Divine commission *to his contemporaries*. To them his entire message is, in the first instance, directed, and that not with the view of satisfying any idle curiosity that would seek gratification in the lifting of the veil that conceals the future; for, on the contrary, prophecy is subservient to the ethico-religious task prescribed to the prophet by the actual conditions and circumstances of his time. Hence, even when he foretells future

sufficient equivalent for *zeitgeschichtlich*, though it is the only single word available.—TR.]

[1] Cp. BERTHEAU, "Die alttestamentliche Weissagung von Israels Reichsherrlichkeit in seinem Land," 2nd and 3rd parts, in the *Jahrbüchern für deutsche Theologie*, vol. iv. pp. 595 ff., and vol. v. pp. 486 ff.

events, the prophet keeps always in view the conditions and circumstances of the actual present. From them he starts, and in relation to them his prophecy has a definite aim. These propositions are not contradicted by the fact that it is frequently represented as the purpose of a prophetic utterance, particularly of its committal to writing, that it should be acknowledged at the time of fulfilment: that Jehovah had long foreseen the particular events in question, and that they are the carrying out of a decree passed by Him long before. It is notorious that we frequently meet with expressions to this effect in Isa. 40–66, as well as in scattered references elsewhere.[1] It goes without saying that a prophecy which announces future events is *also* intended for the future, and similarly, that a prophet may be impelled by the obtuseness of his contemporaries to write out expressly, for the benefit of a more receptive posterity, the word of God that can find no entrance into present ears. But this does not exclude the fact that the prophecy always stands *primarily* in a definite teleological relation to the conditions and circumstances of the present, and is *primarily* intended for the contemporaries of the prophet. Never did a prophet prophesy without intending first of all to exercise a determining influence upon their inner life and conduct.—What is true of prophecy in general is also true of *Messianic prophecy in particular*. It also is intended, in the first instance, to serve a purpose of comfort and warning

[1] Cp. *e.g.* Isa. 8. 1 ff., 30. 8 ff., 34. 16, Hab. 2. 2 f.

to the contemporaries of the prophet in their actual circumstances. It is designed to awaken and to strengthen in the hearts of the responsive the faith that, in spite of all the obstacles thrown in its way by the unfaithfulness and hard-heartedness of the people, the judgments thus entailed, and the power of enemies outside, God's purpose of grace regarding Israel will yet attain accomplishment; yea even, that present history and immediately impending future events, little as human eyes and thoughts may be able to perceive it, are part of the way on which a faithful covenant-God conducts the people of His possession to their predestined goal. In order to accomplish this its primary object, it *was necessary for Messianic prophecy to place itself invariably in intimate relationship with the precise ethico-religious condition and outward position of Israel at the time, as well as with the immediately impending catastrophes of judgment.* As often then as the circumstances of the time were substantially altered, the fact that Messianic prophecy was directed to the new state of affairs involved of necessity that even its general features should be differently outlined. Hence a later prophet never repeats the known Messianic utterances of his predecessor precisely in the same form in which he receives them, nor is he content merely to develop their meaning more fully, or to define it more accurately. On the contrary, while holding firmly the same fundamental thoughts, he feels himself at liberty, in view of the historical circumstances of *his own* time, and of the practical problem which they prescribe to

him, to sketch a new picture of the perfect time, adopting only those individual features of the former picture which retain their original significance in spite of altered circumstances. Thus Messianic prophecy remains ever fresh and living, it ever and again renews its youth, and amid all changes of historical circumstance becomes a source of comfort to believing men in the sufferings and dangers to which they are actually exposed at the moment, strengthens them against the doubts presently assailing their faith and hope, and persuades to repentance all who are not wholly insusceptible, by just those prospects of salvation which are best calculated, in their circumstances, to win their hearts.

What results thus from the destination of Messianic prophecy, results equally from its psychologically mediated origin. When a prophet brings the Messianic salvation into close connexion with the conditions and circumstances of his time, he is not following his own free choice, made with a view to the practical problem of the hour; rather, he is following an inward necessity. He cannot do otherwise; for his prophecy has been put into his heart and mouth by God, only as it has been organically developed, on the one hand, from his previous knowledge of God's will and purpose; and, on the other, from his knowledge of the historical circumstances of the present, from the perceptions and experiences he has made among his fellow-countrymen, and from his information regarding the world-historical events and political circumstances of his time (cp. pp. 54 ff.).

To make this position at once clearer and more secure, we must form a distinct idea of the *limits which bounded the outlook of the prophets towards the future.* No one, it may be presumed, will deny the general fact that there are such limits. But of what sort they are is a matter of debate, and will remain so, so long as the traditional and the historico-critical views regarding the dates of certain prophecies are in opposition to each other. The controversy, however, affects only a comparatively small portion of the prophetic writings. We possess a considerable number of the prophecies of Isaiah whose genuineness is universally admitted. The same is true of nearly the whole of the *Book of Jeremiah* and of the whole of *Ezekiel;* it is true also of the writings of the prophets Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, Habbakuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Malachi, and of the first eight chapters of Zechariah. Disputes as to the precise dates of individual prophecies in these writings, or as to whether certain passages here and there are or are not later additions to the writings whose name they bear, have no importance for our present problem. Will any one, then, maintain that this undisputed territory is not sufficiently comprehensive to yield us a well-grounded knowledge of the historical character of prophecy, and of the canons and laws to which the Divine method of revelation to the prophets has voluntarily submitted itself? Or is it on any pretext to be held legitimate, after such a knowledge has been actually acquired, to proceed to recognise exceptions to the rule that are wholly without pre-

cedent, in order to justify the ascription of Isa. 40–66 to Isaiah, or of the Apocalypse of Daniel to a prophet living in the Exile ?[1] The possibility of such exceptions might perhaps be conceded, were it not that in relation precisely to those prophecies, on whose behalf the concession is claimed, critical reasons of a *wholly different kind* have invariably to be thrown into the scale of evidence,—reasons which are opposed to the traditional view of the date of their authorship, and which assign them to a date whose acceptance at once brings them completely into line with other prophecies by showing them to bear the same historical character, and to be subject to the same laws. Such a coincidence of proofs warns us against the concession of exceptions, and justifies us in assuming the universal validity of these limitations of the vision of the future, and of those canons and laws of the Divine mode of revelation to the prophets which the study of the proportionately great number of admittedly genuine prophecies has taught us.[2]

[1] Cp. *e.g.* DELITZSCH's closing remarks on Part iii. of DRECHSLER's *Kommentar zu Jesaias*, p. 391 : "But such a complete naturalisation in the distant future, sustained throughout twenty-seven discourses, as we should have to assume in the case of chaps. 40–66, is surely, in the complete absence of a precedent, surprising." Cp. in addition, p. 389.

[2] It was gratifying to me to find even KÖNIG in complete agreement with me on this point, as in general in the recognition of the limits to the prophets' vision of the future ; cp. in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 307 ff. In accordance with his fundamental view of prophecy he naturally proceeds to find the reason of these limits retaining their validity, even in the case of those utterances expressly designated as the speech of Jehovah, in the will of God to accommodate Himself to the historical horizon of the prophets and their hearers.

What are these limits and laws? In the content of the prophetic vision of the future we have to distinguish *two different elements*. The *one* is of a more ideal and general nature, the *other* is more concrete and historical. The germs from which the prophetic cognitions that go to make up the former have grown, are partly the fundamental ideas of the Old Testament religion present to the prophetic consciousness, partly also the preception of certain general circumstances that remain the same in all times. Those prophetic cognitions, on the other hand, which constitute the other element in the prophetic vision of the future, root besides in the acquaintance of the prophet with the special historical conditions and circumstances of the actual present.

From the law of Jehovah received by tradition, and from revelations to previous prophets, every prophet knows the unalterable purpose of Jehovah to preserve His Kingdom, founded upon earth, by the exhibition of His judicial punitive justice upon God-forsaken evil-doers, of His grace and faithfulness towards the godly or repentant, and of His almighty power and holy majesty against heathen peoples, who seek to frustrate His gracious designs, and to conduct it to its goal of perfection by acts of judgment and grace, which bring salvation to Israel and blessing to all peoples. Hence: *every prophet's vision of the future reaches to the end of the ways of God.* The ultimate goal of the history of the Kingdom of God is *not* indeed present to the vision of them all with the *same clearness*

and completeness. In the delineation of it there emerge significant differences in the degree of religious perception. But the *prospect itself* of the complete accomplishment of Jehovah's purpose of grace is not absent from any of the prophets. The prophecy of this goal of perfection develops itself in a special degree from those ideas explained in the First Part which are implied in the very fact of the Old Testament religion and theocracy. Of substantially similar nature is the announcement, to be found in many of the prophets, of a final conflict between universal heathendom and the Kingdom of God, which will immediately precede the last time, and will end in the complete and for ever decisive victory of the latter, and with a judgment upon assailants of the Kingdom, such as will annihilate the power of the heathen. We find such announcements—developed under various forms—first in Joel 3. 9 ff., then in Micah 4. 11–13 and 5. 4 f., further in Zech. 12. 1 ff., and 14. 3 ff. 12 ff., in greatest detail in Ezek. chaps. 38 and 39, finally also in Deutero-Isaiah 66. 18 ff. Even these prophecies —if we except minute details—owe no special debt to the circumstances of the times in which they were uttered; apart from the idea of the Theocracy itself, their native soil is simply the conception of the relation of hostility—the same for all ages—between corporate heathendom and the Kingdom of God, and the historical experience that, just because of this hostile attitude which the kingdoms of the world, on the one hand, and the Kingdom of God on the other, owe it to their

essential mutual differences to assume to each other, the course of the Theocracy lies through hard conflicts to ultimate victory and peace.

As to the *other*—or concrete historical—element in the prophecies relating to the future, it has been rightly observed: "Prophecy does not derive its knowledge of the future from the content of the historical present, but from the counsel of God, who overrules history, making even apparently opposing facts subservient to His ends."[1] But how is this derivation from the counsel of God effected? Only through the Spirit of God assuring the prophet that in accordance with the laws of Divine universal government *future history* must and will *shape itself out of the conditions and circumstances of the present as known to him*, in order that the counsel of God, which in its fundamental features is also known to him, may attain fulfilment.[2] Hence, as we see invariably, prophecy applies to the present and to the immediate future the same fundamental laws of God's government of the world and His own Kingdom, under whose light prophetic historical narrative views the past; here as there, there is the same prophetico-theocratic pragmatism governing, in the one case, the representation of what *has* happened, and, in the other, the consideration of the actual present and what *is to* result from it. It is only in regard to the prospect of those historical

[1] Cp. Oehler, art. "Weissagung" in Herzog's *Realencyklopädie*, xvii. p. 652.

[2] Cp. Ewald, *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, iii. pp. 204 ff. and i. pp. 88 ff.

particulars, which stand in some sort of immediate connexion with the circumstances of the present, that the Spirit of God can assure the prophet; He cannot certify him of those which have no such connexion, for the entire consciousness of the prophet offers not a single point at which such unrelated knowledge could originate. This limitation results from the law of a revelation which refuses to be magical—a law which the Divine Revealer has imposed *upon Himself*, not one by which *we* seek to bind Him. In virtue of this law, *every prophet has a definite historical horizon which limits his view of the future.* The limit may be a narrower or a wider one; *but it never reaches further than the point to which the present—viewed in the light of the Divine purpose—carries the future in its bosom.—Within* this *times*-horizon, the certainty which the prophet owes to the Spirit of God in regard to what is contained in the counsel of God may be a perfectly clear and *definite foreknowledge of individual historical facts*, which prophecy announces quite definitely and unconditionally. Thus, *e.g.*, MICAIAH, son of Imlah, prophesies with perfect definiteness that Ahab and Jehoshaphat will be defeated by the Aramaeans, voluntarily submitting to imprisonment and offering to be treated as a false prophet should his word not be fulfilled.[1] AMOS announces similarly the impending destruction of the kingdom of Damascus, and the carrying away of the Aramaeans to their original seat in Kir.[2] ISAIAH is perfectly certain that kings Rezin

[1] 1 Kings 22. 17 ff. [2] Amos 1. 3 ff.; cp. 2 Kings 16. 9.

and Pekah will not succeed in capturing Jerusalem, and that in less than three years their countries will be devastated by the Assyrian armies,[1] but that Judah also will be hard pressed by the Assyrians, from whom Ahaz expects his help.[2] Similarly he announces the deliverance of Jerusalem from the army of Sennacherib, the annihilation of the latter by the immediate intervention of Jehovah, and the hasty flight of Sennacherib into his own land.[3] JEREMIAH, on the other hand, announces that God has irrevocably decreed the destruction of Jerusalem and the downfall of the Jewish State through "His servant" Nebuchadnezzar; in the same manner he prophesies, however, also the judgment that

[1] Isa. 7. 7. 16, 8. 4.

[2] Isa. 7. 18 ff., 8. 5 ff. The comparison of the two last-cited passages affords an instructive proof of how the prophets, with the view of imparting an air of life and forceful reality to their threats and promises, as well as of making them more tangible for the people, frequently depict the details of an impending judgment or deliverance of Jehovah *without themselves attaching any particular importance to the individual features of their delineation, or intending to make the truth of their prophecies depend upon their actual occurrence.* Hence they do not hesitate in the reproduction of a prophecy to alter this or that individual feature of the picture. Thus in Isa. 7. 18 ff., the prophet represents the devastation of Judaea as brought about by the mutual encounter of an Assyrian *and an Egyptian* army—a view of things which undoubtedly presupposes that the latter will march to Judaea, in order to set bounds to the advance of Assyrian dominion; in the reproduction, however, of the prophecy, 8. 5 ff., about a year and a half later, he mentions only the Assyrians as the instrument of the Divine judgment.

[3] Cp. esp. Isa. 10. 33 f., 14. 24 ff., 29. 7 f., 30. 27 ff., 31. 5. 8 f., 37. 33 ff. The two passages Isa. 30. 33 and 31. 8 f. form another *locus* in proof of our remark in the *note* above. In the former the prophet assumes that Sennacherib himself will fall with his army; in the reproduction of the prophecy he says only that the king will fall back in terror-stricken flight (cp. also 37. 34).

will overtake Babylon about seventy years later, and the consequent deliverance and return of the exiles; and the same prophet warns the false prophet Hananiah, that he will die that very year.[1] The fulfilment or non-fulfilment of such definite prophecies —be they prophecies of salvation or of disaster—is the authorised criterion of the genuine or the false prophet.[2] All historical facts, preannounced in these and similar prophecies, lie within the *times*-horizon of the particular prophet; and the foreknowledge of them is to be judged of psychologically according to the remarks made at pp. 49 ff.—Of the *further* course of future history, on the other hand, which stands in no immediate relation to the present, so far as the latter is known to the prophet, prophecy derives no knowledge from the counsel of God. *Fresh periods of development* in the history of the Theocracy, starting under totally different conditions and circumstances, as well as also the individual events that belong to them, are veiled even to the prophet in the mystery of the Divine counsel. Hence it is always but the next piece of the historical road along which God will lead His people—that, viz., which lies between the present and the next epoch, which makes

[1] Jer. 28. 16.

[2] Deut. 18. 22, Jer. 28. 8 f. Cp. H. Schultz in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 57 f.; in the 2nd ed. pp. 242 f. Bertheau (*Jahrbb. f. D. Th.* iv. p. 352) wrongly limits Deut. 18. 22, which manifestly refers to all definite prophecies of the near future, to prophecies of *salvation*. The fact that false prophecies were for the *most* part prophecies of salvation, does not justify this arbitrary limitation of the natural meaning of the text, and passages like 1 Kings 22. 8, Micah 3. 5, and Ezek. 13. 22, show that the law must have been applicable to false prophecies of disaster as well.

a turning-point in the history of the Theocracy—that the enlightened eye of the prophet can survey with more or less distinctness.

This piece of road, however, he recognises as conducting to the goal which God's decree of grace has set for itself; for those ideal cognitions of future history already referred to may be compared, as regards their relation to that portion of the concrete historical progress of the Kingdom of God which is actually within the prophet's view, to the sky which bounds the portion of country, the view of which is commanded by some lofty watch-tower. The goal of perfection lies, indeed, as we have seen, open to the vision of every prophet who looks into the future. There lie beyond his horizon only those stages in the historical development of the Kingdom which may intervene before the course towards the goal of perfection, conceived as starting from the point which bounds the prophet's prospect, is completed. Here, therefore, we mark the *first limit* of the prophetic prospect. We are fully persuaded that every exegete who is accustomed to interpret prophecy, not according to its actual or supposed fulfilment, but first and foremost according to the sense which the prophet himself attached to his words, will obtain from an examination of the admittedly genuine prophecies precisely the result we have just indicated. What might be inferred *à priori* proves itself thus in entire accordance with the actual facts.[1]

[1] That even the prophecy Micah 4. 10 is not entitled to the claim that has been made for it, as supplying the most decisive argument

On the *second* limit to the prophet's view of the future we may be brief. It is generally admitted. It lies in the fact that the *time and hour* of the

against our view (HENGSTENBERG, *Christologie*, 2nd ed. i. p. 541), can easily be proved, and has been in the main acknowledged even by CASPARI in his, in many respects, excellent work, *Ueber Micha den Morasthiten*, Christiania 1851, pp. 172 ff. For Micah does not refer to the captivity of the Jews by the *Chaldeans*, which happened about 130 years after the date of his prophecy, but to a deportation of them to Babylon by the *Assyrians*. This is proved, *first*, by the general fact that he nowhere speaks of the Chaldeans, but always rather regards the Assyrians as the instrument of the divine judgment. Even in the Messianic time Assyria is the world-power which has to be overthrown (Micah 5. 4 f.). *Secondly*, the first half of 4. 10 corresponds manifestly, as regards date, with 3. 12. And in Jer. 26. 18 f. it is expressly said that this threat was *not* fulfilled, because Jehovah repented of the evil He had designed in view of the conversion of Hezekiah and the people. We are therefore by no means warranted in recognising in the captivity by the Chaldeans, a fulfilment of *this* threat *in its concrete historical interpretation*, but must, according to Jer. 26, refer Micah's prophecy to a judgment which was averted in the time of Hezekiah,—a judgment of which the agents could have been only the Assyrians. HENGSTENBERG'S objections to this interpretation are simply unscriptural (in *loc. cit.* p. 540).—Micah could well, moreover, prophesy a captive transportation to Babylon by the Assyrians. For Babylon belonged at this time (the time of Hezekiah) to the Assyrians. As early as the first year of his reign (745) Tiglath-Peleser had overthrown Babylon, bearing in consequence the title: "King of Sumir and Akkad," *i.e.* of Babylonia, and later (731) he confirmed the Assyrian supremacy by a second campaign (cp. SCHRADER, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, pp. 128 ff.; 2nd ed. pp. 231 ff., 249, 259). The Babylonians, however, constantly endeavoured to regain their independence; the king of South Babylonia, Merodach Baladan I., in particular made repeatedly vigorous attempts to throw off the Assyrian yoke. In consequence of this Sargon afterwards undertook an expedition into Babylonia in the first year of his reign (721), and, after conquering Merodach Baladan, *transported some of the Babylonians to Syria* (SCHRADER in *loc. cit.* pp. 162 ff., 264; 2nd ed. pp. 276 ff., 403; cp. 2 Kings 17. 24).—If Micah's prophecy belongs to a date subsequent to this event, the historical circumstances were peculiarly favourable to the idea of a deportation to Babylonia; but even if the prophecy should be

perfect accomplishment of God's saving purpose remain concealed from the prophets, as they are indeed even from the apostles and the Son Himself, seeing they

assigned a somewhat earlier date, the glance of the prophet might—in view of the known policy of the Assyrians of securing conquered territories by the method of transplanting populations—easily have been directed to Babylonia, which was in special need of such a security. Furthermore, Micah's contemporary, Isaiah, in a later utterance threatened the steward Shebna with transportation to Mesopotamia or Babylonia at the hand of the Assyrians, for one or other of these districts must be intended in the "land that is broad on both sides" (Isa. 22. 18); and even Sennacherib entertains the idea of a deportation to one of them (Isa. 36. 17). But in addition to that derived from the historical circumstances, Micah was influenced further by a motive derived from his typico-prophetic way of looking at history. He is fond of setting future events in parallelism with the record of former times (cp. 4. 8, 5. 2). Assyria is in his eyes the land of Nimrod (5. 6), and the first capital of Nimrod's dominion was Babel, Gen. 10. 10. There, in the first seat of a world-power, the distress of the people of God is to reach its extremity; there also, however, will be their triumph over the world-power.—It may be said, indeed, that Micah's prophecy was fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity under the Chaldeans, inasmuch as these events revealed for the first time with distinctness the Divine purpose, that the way to the goal of perfection should lie through a catastrophe which involved the complete shattering of the theocracy in the external form in which it existed at that time. We may also recognise a "singular historic coincidence" in the fact that just this *Babel*, mentioned by Micah, should have been afterwards the land of the Exile. But it must be frankly conceded that Micah's threat—in its concrete historical interpretation—was *not* fulfilled. He did *not* foretell the future historical fact of the *Chaldean captivity* of the Jews, and his prophecy does not go beyond the analogy of other prophecies because of the mention of Babylon as the scene of Israel's distress and deliverance, but keeps within the ordinary limitations and laws.—I allow these remarks to stand unaltered, as I concur neither with the *dictum* of Stade, that Micah 4. 10 "is at all events a *vaticinium ex eventu*" (*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1881, p. 167), nor with Nowack's assumption, that at least the words *ubhā'th adh-Bābhĕl* (and thou shalt go unto Babylon), are a later addition (*id.* 1884, p. 286); that these words "utterly contradict all that we know of the prophecies of the Assyrian period" cannot be reasonably

are known only to the Father.[1] It belongs, however, to the nature of all living hope to bring the expected boon *as near as possible* to the present time, and this is specially true of a hope that springs from a faith in the almighty God, Who has but to speak to accomplish the greatest marvels. Hence just as the apostles expected the second coming of Christ in glory as an event in immediate prospect,[2] which in fact they themselves hoped to survive, *so all the prophets expected the speedy initiation of the Messianic time.* The energy of their faith and hope attracted the Messianic salvation to the utmost possible nearness to their own time —in other words, *brought it to the very border of the times-horizon that bounded their prospect.* It is this circumstance, and not the visionary character of the revelations made to the prophets, which serves to explain why the salvation of the Messianic time is always the bright background of the picture in which they represent the *immediately impending* judgments.

Now it lies in the nature of the case that the prophetic consciousness, owing to its belief in the near salvation of the perfect time, does not distinguish carefully between the immediately impending future of the Kingdom of God and its final goal, but connects them organically with each other, and combines them

affirmed in view of the passages cited above from Isaiah. The latest criticism is in general far too ready to assume "contradictions," and in relation to Micah, in particular, the apparent contradiction of Micah 3. 12 with a whole series of Isaiah's prophecies, ought to warn against such hasty assumptions.

[1] Matt. 24. 36, Mark 13. 32, Acts 1. 7.

[2] 1 Cor. 15. 51 f., 1 Thess. 4. 16 f.

in a single view. Even though the prophet is conscious that he cannot accurately fix the time for the commencement of the Messianic era,—and except in the Book of Daniel we nowhere find exact indications of date,[1] — yet he sets the conditions and circumstances of the present and of the nearest future, that shapes itself from them, in immediate relation to the goal of history, recognising that the ways along which God is actually accompanying His people assuredly conduct to it. And, if his hope *presents*[2] this goal to him as near, why should he not in his delineation of it encroach upon this present?[3] He necessarily looks at the present and the immediate future in the light that is reflected from the end of the ways of God, for in this light alone are the riddles solved which are involved in the history of his time.

He knows, however, the obstacles which *present* conditions and circumstances oppose to the attainment of the goal, and the state of contradiction into which judgments that are either impending or are already taking effect will throw, or are actually throwing, the position of the people of God and their relation to heathen peoples with the position and attitude which are designed for them in the counsel of God, and which they will be permitted to enjoy in security

[1] An exact indication of the time when the Messias should be born can be found in Isa. 7. 14 ff. only on the supposition that the prophet really intends Immanuel as the Messias. But we cannot consider this hypothesis correct. No argument in this connexion can be founded on the Book of Daniel, which is a late aftergrowth of the elder type of prophecy.

[2] *Vergegenwärtigt.* [3] See Appendix A, Note VI.

after the attainment of the goal. The removal of these obstacles and the setting aside of this contradiction must therefore form a part of his Messianic prophecy, if the latter is put into his heart and mouth by the Spirit of God only as psychologically mediated, and standing in genetic connexion with the cognitions, conceptions, and ideas which constitute the stock-furniture of his mind. Thus without any conscious intention on his part, and following solely an inward compulsion, the prophet always gives in greater or less degree a times-colouring to his delineation of the perfect time, and the final deeds of Divine power which bring it about. For not only does he himself look at the historical present in the light of the perfect time, but also *vice versa* he sees the brightness of the latter only in the broken coloured light in which the atmosphere of the historical present suffers it to appear. Hence it is that we read in the Messianic prophecies of the reunion of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes with the kingdom of Judah, of the restoration of the royal house of David to its former power, of the overthrow of the Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, and Philistines, of the crushing of the oppressive yoke of Assyria, and the like.—It need hardly be said that in such concrete times-coloured features we cannot, with HENGSTENBERG, see *mere pictures*, borrowed from the circumstances in which the prophets lived, in order to give a comprehensible idea of the character of the Kingdom of Christ.[1]—In

[1] Cp. HENGSTENBERG'S *Christologie*, 2nd ed. iii. 2, pp. 194 ff.

so far, at least, as the sense attached to their utterances by the prophets themselves is concerned, the fact that they speak of the Messias as a king resident on Mount Zion, is not to be set to the mere account of their pictorial style. If they say that in the perfect time Israel will no more seek help from Assyria or Egypt, *they* do not mean to represent merely Israel's faithfulness to his God under the pictorial form of a particular arbitrarily-chosen instance. The cessation of the dualism between the kingdom of Judah and that of the Ten Tribes is not to *them* merely a symbolic expression of the idea that peace and love will reign among the people of God. And when in their Messianic outlooks they speak of the overthrow of the Edomites, Moabites, etc., or of a judgment upon Assyria, Babylon, etc., neither is the *overthrow* to be at once translated into its spiritual meaning, nor are the peoples mentioned merely typical representatives of the world-power that stands opposed to the Kingdom of God. To the prophets themselves, and to those to whom their message in the first instance came, all such times-borrowed features in their prophecies have a much more substantial and immediately practical meaning. Not something which they figuratively represent, but what they actually say, in the simple meaning of their words, is in the eyes of the prophets and their contemporaries imperative to Israel's participation in his destined salvation and glory; and it is precisely these times-borrowed features that contribute very

largely to the fitness of prophecy to fulfil its immediate destination, as described above (pp. 133 ff.). The spiritualising evaporation of the entire concrete matter of Messianic prophecy is the just consequence of HENGSTENBERG's[1] failure to fulfil the first duty of an exegete, that, viz., of placing himself on the standpoint of the Old Testament, and in particular of the several prophets, so as to judge of the sense which they themselves attached to their words.

The expectation that the "end of days" is near, occasions, however, not merely the adoption into the *picture of the Messianic time* of features borrowed from the times; it involves, further, the frequent glorification of the *immediate future* in the light of the end of the ways of God. An immediately impending judgment is not unfrequently portrayed as if it were to be the final judgment of the world. This happens especially when the prophecy is still of a somewhat indefinite

[1] To do justice, however, to HENGSTENBERG's view of the times-borrowed features of Messianic prophecy, we must not forget that his main concern is always to elucidate the sense which *God* intended in the prophetic utterances, and not that which the prophets themselves attached to them (cp. the expression of his meaning, cited p. 6). Hence his conception has, as we shall see, a certain relative value in cases where the interest of the inquiry does not turn on what he calls "the constitution of the prophecy" (*die Beschaffenheit der Weissagung*), but upon the exact determination of its ultimate aim, as judged by the fulfilment. It were to be wished only that he had himself remained true to his postulate that this twofold sense was "to be accurately distinguished," and that he had not so misjudged the historical sense of prophecy! As against his spiritualising exegesis, cp. DELITZSCH, *Die biblisch-prophetische Theologie, ihre Fortbildung durch Chr. A. Crusius und ihre neueste Entwickelung seit der Christologie Hengstenbergs*, Leipzig 1845, pp. 167 ff.; OEHLER in *loc. cit.* pp. 649 f.; and BERTHEAU in the *Jahrbb. f. D. Theol.* iv. pp. 622 and 626.

nature; whereas, so soon as the prophet is able to announce definitely the precise mode in which the judgment will take effect, the ideal features, representing the picture of the last great catastrophe, became less prominent in his utterances. An instructive *locus* on this point is the powerful delineation of the impending day of judgment (Isa. 2), in which every high thing shall be brought low, and Jehovah alone shall maintain His transcendence above a finally-demolished idolatry, as compared with the more definite announcement in Isa. 5. 25 ff., that the impending judgment will be effected in two acts, and that the Assyrian army will be the executor of the second act. In the same way near-expected times of salvation and grace are frequently so portrayed that their commencement appears entirely coincident with that of the perfect time.

We cannot pause here to prove in detail how the Messianic messages of the prophets, whose delivery was spread over the course of centuries, attest the foregoing expositions. While referring the reader on this point to the discussions of BERTHEAU, of which we have made frequent mention, we are content at present to adduce some *loci*, for the purpose rather of illustrating than of fundamentally establishing what has been said.

In the case of the oldest prophets whose utterances are preserved to us—viz. JOEL, AMOS, and HOSEA—the times-horizon of their outlook to the future reaches only to the turning-point in the history of the Theocracy, that began with the intervention in the fortunes of Israel of the world-power of Assyria; and

immediately behind this lies the Messianic time. Although these prophets clearly recognise that much must be altered in the people and kingdom of God before the final goal is reached, yet, according to their prophecy, the history of the Theocracy comes somewhat rapidly to its end, and its course is a very simple one. With JOEL (between 830 and 810) it is entirely that of a straight line. In the astoundingly terrible plague of locusts and the long-continued dearth, which in his time desolated the land and caused a severe famine, he saw an immediate indication of the nearness of the day of judgment—even the beginning of the final judgment itself.[1] But when the people respond obediently to his call to repentance, he does not hold out any fresh threats of Divine judgment against Judah and Jerusalem. On the contrary, after the deliverance from the present extremity there follow, without further intervening catastrophes,[2] the Divine deeds through which Jehovah's purpose of grace attains fulfilment — the reunion with the people of God of the Judaeans and inhabitants of Jerusalem, who had been held captive by the distant sons of Javan; the universal outpouring of the Spirit; and the judgment of annihilation upon the heathen peoples assembled for the final conflict

[1] Joel 1. 15, 2. 1 f. 11. Just here lies a moment in the proof of the high antiquity of the prophecy of Joel, to which sufficient attention has not yet been paid. The dates incidentally given in the text are justified in the art. "Zeitrechnung" in my *Bibelwörterbuch*.

[2] The *'achărē-khēn* (after this) of Joel 2. 28 is, of course, an indefinite expression; but, considering the prophet's view, as explained above, of the present extremity, we are certainly not justified in regarding it as meaning for him a prolonged interval.

with the Kingdom of God, through which Israel is for ever secured against their assaults. Had Joel not left the kingdom of the Ten Tribes entirely out of account, he would, of course, hardly have represented the way to the ultimate goal as so evenly paved. AMOS (*circa* 760) and his younger contemporary HOSEA, whose mission concerns principally the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, see already somewhat more of what the immediate future conceals in its bosom for Israel. Not simply for the heathen, but for the people of God themselves, there is imminent a severe catastrophe of judgment. It concerns chiefly the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, which will be wholly uprooted, whose inhabitants — as many of them as have not fallen victims to death—will be scattered among the nations. Thus will God's judgment remove the evil of a divided kingdom. Only the, comparatively speaking, less guilty kingdom of the royal house of David, to whom God's promise is given, will continue its existence. Yet Judah also is struck by the terrible judgment,[1] for it is intended in general to extirpate all evil-doers from among the people of God.[2] These prophets also foresee that the judgment will be effected by a people who have but lately appeared on the scene of history, and who come from the far North. But this marks the limit of their prospect. This new people have but entered within their horizon, and are still half in the dark. By Amos, and in the earlier prophecies of

[1] Amos 2. 5, 6. 1, Hos. 5. 10. 12 ff., 6. 4, 8. 14, 10. 11, 12. 2.
[2] Amos 9. 10.

Hosea (chaps. 1–3), they are not mentioned by name; only in his later prophecies (chaps. 4–14) Hosea points to the Assyrian as the principal instrument of the avenging judgment, and to Assyria as the land of exile. But even there it remains obscure how God will again deliver His people from the power of this mighty enemy. Similarly, neither of them knows anything either of a *judgment* threatening *Assyria* or of the impending *downfall* of the kingdom of Judah. Deeply as the latter will be humbled by the judgment, it will yet not sink under the weight of it, like the kingdom of the Ten Tribes.[1] On the contrary, so soon as the double object of the judgment is accomplished upon the people of God,—the restoration, viz., of the unity of the kingdom by the destruction of the specially guilty kingdom, and the extirpation of evil-doers from the community, or, otherwise, the conversion of the remnant of the people,—the time of the Messianic salvation is just about to commence, in which Jehovah restores the fallen Davidic kingdom in its former brilliancy and power, and makes the kingdom united and great as of yore. The people of God will then, however, participate in all the external blessings and spiritual gifts which are implied in the completeness of their fellowship with God.—The immediate relation in which the Messianic oracles of these oldest prophets stand to the historical circumstances of their time must be at once apparent to every one. JOEL begins with

[1] The destruction of the kingdom is not to be read into the refrain-like announcement Amos 2. 5, repeated almost verbally in Hos. 8. 14.

the comforting promise that Jehovah will completely deliver the repentant people from the present extremity, destroy the locust-army, send henceforward abundant and timely rain, and bless the land with wonderful fruitfulness;[1] and towards the end also[2] the prophet comes back to this just then peculiarly comforting and attractive promise. Because, further, the kingdom of Judah had, since Rehoboam's time, to suffer much from the attacks of hostile neighbours, first from the Egyptians;[3] then from the Edomites, who had invaded the land and butchered defenceless inhabitants;[4] recently, however, and specially, from the Philistines,[5] who, in alliance with Arab tribes, had forced their way into the capital itself, slain most of the royal family, plundered palace and temple, and, by means of the Phoenicians (who had followed the army as slave-dealers), sold the prisoners of war as slaves to the Edomites and the distant sons of Javan,—Joel's threat of judgment is directed specially against these peoples, while his Messianic oracle takes the form of a promise of deliverance and return to the captives,[6] and of security to the kingdom and its capital against the attacks of neighbouring peoples. Add to which that

[1] Joel 2. 18–27. [2] Joel 3. 18. [3] 1 Kings 14. 25 f.

[4] Joel 3. 19. The suffix in *b'artsām* (in their land) is not, as has been assumed from 2 Kings 8. 20, to be referred to the Edomites. It has rather to be connected with *'ăshĕr*, and to be referred to *bĕne yehūdhāh:* "in whose land they have shed innocent blood." Cp. on the order of the words, Isa. 7. 16. Rightly: CREDNER and WÜNSCHE *in loco.*

[5] Joel 3. 1–18, 2 Chron. 21. 16 f., 22. 1 Am. 1. 6 and 9.

[6] Joel 3. 1. 7.

his whole announcement of the straight course of the history of the Kingdom of God to its goal is throughout conditioned by the fact that he cannot charge the people of the kingdom of Judah with any defection from their God, and that they were ready to obey his call to repentance.—AMOS is acquainted with the prophecies of JOEL; but there is only *one* feature of the latter's testimony—that, viz., of the wonderful fertility of the holy land—that he reproduces substantially unaltered.[1] He speaks, indeed, as does also HOSEA, of a return of the captives, but the *captives* mean no longer in either case the Judaeans sold to the sons of Javan, but the inhabitants of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, who, in accordance with the threats contained in their prophecies, have been carried into exile and scattered among the nations. For the rest, the times-colouring of their Messianic promises appears particularly in the prophecy of the reunion of the entire theocracy under the royal house of David; in that regarding the reconquest of the neighbouring peoples, especially the remnant of the Edomites;[2] and in the announcement that in the perfect time Israel will no longer, as at present, seek his help, now from Asshur and now from Egypt.[3] But in spite of all this times-colouring, the oracles of these oldest prophets really present to us *the end of the ways of God;* we need think only of Joel's prophecy of the universal outpouring of the Spirit, or of Hosea's beautiful delineations of the intimate and eternal love-covenant on

[1] Amos 9. 13; cp. Joel 3. 18. [2] Amos 9. 12. [3] Hos. 14. 3.

which, in the last days, Jehovah will enter with the people of His possession.[1]

On account of the corruption that had set in under the rule of the idolatrous Ahaz, the announcements of judgment in the prophets of the Assyrian period, Isaiah and Micah,—a judgment which the Assyrians should execute even upon Judah,—strike a more decided note of condemnation than is heard from the elder prophets. Both prophets announce repeatedly that only a small *remnant* even of the Judaeans will turn to Jehovah, escape corruption, and, as the true Israel, the parent stock of a new elect people, enjoy the promised salvation.[2] Indeed, according to Micah, the impending judgment will involve the shattering of the existing theocracy, the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and the carrying captive of the people to Babylon.[3] And even Isaiah prophesied the same extreme disaster, not merely in the time of Ahaz,[4] but even as late as that of Hezekiah, at the time when the king showed an inclination to follow the advice of the magnates, and, in spite of the prophetic warning, seek his salvation in an alliance with Egypt.[5] When, however, Hezekiah turned with his whole heart to Jehovah —on which account, according to Jer. 26. 18 f., God repented of the judgment threatened through Micah— Isaiah could again, as he had done before, announce

[1] Hos. 2. 20 ff., 14. 4 ff.
[2] Isa. 6. 13, 7. 22, 10. 20 ff., Micah 2. 12, 4. 6 f., 5. 3, 7. 18.
[3] Micah 1. 16, 3. 12, 4. 9 f., 5. 1, 7. 13.
[4] Isa. 7. 17 ff. ; cp. 28. 14 ff.
[5] Isa. 32. 9 ff. ; cp. also 22. 1 ff. and 30. 12 ff.

with confident Divinely-wrought certainty that the overweening Assyrian would not succeed in taking the city of God, and that matters would *not* reach such an extremity as the downfall of the kingdom.[1]—If, so far, the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah are only such advances upon and preciser definitions of the announcements of an Amos or a Hosea as correspond with the progress of historical development and with the ethico-religious conditions of their time, their foresight of the future is in *this* respect superior to that of their predecessors,[2] that they see clearly and definitely, *behind* the judgment of Jehovah upon the kingdom of Judah, the judgment of almighty vengeance[3] which will chastise the insolence of the Assyrian, break his power, and again deliver the people of God from his violence. For, in the meantime, it had become clear how serious an obstacle the Assyrian supremacy, with its high-flown schemes of conquest and its openly-announced intention of putting an end once for all to the independent existence of the kingdom of Judah, presented to the ultimate carrying out of God's purpose of grace towards Israel. Nothing but the complete shattering of the Assyrian power could pave the way to the erection of the perfect Kingdom. But this latter event ISAIAH sets in the closest and most immediate connexion with the impending deliverance

[1] Isa. 33, 37. 22 ff.; cp. 10. 32 ff., 14. 24 ff., 17. 12 ff., 18. 4 ff., 29. 5 ff., 30. 27 ff., 31. 5. 8 f.

[2] With the sole exception of the author of Zech., chaps. 9–11, who had given a brief indication of an impending humiliation of Assyria (Zech. 10. 11).

[3] *Das gewaltige Strafgericht.*

of the people of God from the Assyrian tyranny. All the judicial ends of God are attained in the immediately impending judgments.[1] Hence Israel's deliverance from the yoke of Assyria is the beginning of a series of Divine deeds of grace, by which Israel is inwardly and outwardly prepared for, and made to participate in, the salvation destined for him.[2] Nothing is said of fresh intervening catastrophes. The triumph of the theocracy over the Assyrian supremacy lies on the border of Isaiah's times-horizon, and he sees it transfigured and glorified by the dawn-light of the Messianic salvation. Even though he for once, as in the first half of the eleventh chapter, draws an entirely ideal picture of the perfected Kingdom, yet he does not cease, in the details of the sequel, to give special prominence to the great deed of deliverance, that falls within his horizon, as the basis and beginning of God's final deeds of salvation. This is seen in the fact that the latter half of this chapter, in strange contrast with the former half, is coloured by references of the most pointed and unmistakable kind to contemporary events and politics to a degree not surpassed by any of the other Messianic utterances of Isaiah. And to how great an extent the prophet regards the Messianic prospect as one that had already *drawn near*, he himself expressly tells us;[3] and it is indeed already apparent in the fact that from the moment the host

[1] Isa. 10. 12.
[2] Cp. Isa. 9. 1 ff., 11. 11 ff., 30. 19 ff., 31. 7 ff., 33. 17 ff.
[3] Isa. 29. 17.

of Sennacherib was stirred against the kingdom and city of God, the prophet necessarily expected the principal act of the judgment upon the Assyrians to take place in the nearest future.—Only when he has seen reason to represent the judgment as one that had risen to the pitch of requiring the destruction and devastation of Jerusalem, does he find it necessary to shift backwards to a corresponding distance the prospect of the Messianic salvation.[1] And only after the kingdom and capital have been delivered from the threatening danger of the Assyrian hordes,[2] and Hezekiah has incurred fresh guilt by parading his treasures and stores of arms, and by his vainglorious joy over the honour shown him by the Babylonian king, does the prophet, towards the close of his ministry, open up the further sad prospect of a fresh judgment, which should involve the carrying of the royal family captive to Babylon.[3]

With Micah the dawn of the Messianic time is postponed somewhat further than with Isaiah (except in Isa. 32); for he must place in view the downfall of the existing theocracy and the destruction of the capital —a perception which requires him to make the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the restoration of the Davidic kingship constituent elements of his Messianic oracle.

[1] Isa. 32. 14.

[2] On the decision involved, in the above, of the question regarding the dates of Isaiah's prophecies, cp. the article "Zeitrechnung" in my *Bibelwörterbuch*, p. 1813*b*.

[3] Isa. 39. 5 ff. Always supposing that tradition has given this threatening prophecy of Isaiah its true historical place.

The perspective towards the future is still further extended through the prophet's looking beyond the enthronement of the Messianic king to a final assault upon the Kingdom of God by the united heathen world.[1] Still, Micah's times-horizon is not wider than that of his greater contemporary. For him also the destruction of the Assyrian world-power means the beginning of the restored and completed Kingdom of God,[2] and the Assyrian appears at the head of the heathen confederacy in the final conflict against the holy city, suffering the penalty of his ringleadership in the devastation of his land by the victorious generals of the Messianic king.[3]

The enthronement of the idolatrous Manasseh constituted a new turning-point in the history of the theocracy. His zeal for idol-worship, the introduction of the Baal and Ashtaroth cults into the temple in Jerusalem, the bloody persecution of the faithful worshippers of Jehovah, particularly the prophets, the laxity of the priests, the increasing herd of false prophets, the general declension of the people, reveal how the internal condition of the kingdom of Judah, so hopeful on the whole during the reign of Hezekiah, reached shortly afterwards a lower stage of degradation than it had ever known before. Soon the measure of guilt was fulfilled. Prophecy begins, in consequence, to threaten a fresh and more severe judgment of vengeance, involving the destruction of the capital, the shattering of the kingdom, death for some and cap-

[1] Micah 4. 11-13, 5. 5 f. 15. [2] Micah 7. 8 ff. [3] Micah 5. 5 f.

tivity for others of the people,[1]—a threat which is maintained, even when in the person of Josiah a God-fearing king was once more on the throne, the judgment being only delayed until the godly king shall have entered his rest.[2] Of the executors of the judgment, ZEPHANIAH and even, in his earlier prophecies, JEREMIAH, still speak just as indefinitely as did formerly Amos and Hosea; they are a people who come from the distant North, and speak an unintelligible language.[3] It is only after the Chaldeans have begun, in the beginning of the reign of Jehoiachim, to assume, in Anterior Asia, the part formerly played by the Assyrians (*i.e.* after the battle of Carchemish, 606 B.C.), that *they* are definitely indicated as the instrument to be used by Jehovah to execute the judgment decreed against Israel and all other peoples. —The whole terrible contrast between the position into which Israel should shortly fall through his guilt, and the great destiny assigned him in God's purpose of grace, lay clearly before the enlightened eyes of the prophets. They saw quite close at hand a time in which the kingdom of God should appear to the eyes of men as altogether brought to nothing, and Israel must once again, as in Egypt, endure the yoke of ignominious bondage far from the holy land. Before

[1] Cp. 2 Kings 21. 11 ff.

[2] Cp. 2 Kings 22. 15 ff., 23. 26 f., Jer. 15. 4.

[3] The hypothesis that the prophecies of Zephaniah and of Jer. 3. 6–6. 30 find their historical explanation in the invasion of Anterior Asia by the Scythians, narrated by Herodotus (i. 15, 103–106; iv. 11, 12), I consider untenable.

their eyes stood also the mighty Babylon, equipped with all the implements of power, so as finally to secure the world-supremacy she is shortly to snatch for herself. But certain as it is that this mighty colossus must fall in pieces before the theocracy can rise erect upon its ruins, it is still not in it, but in the guilt of Israel, whose cry is gone up to heaven, and in his stiff-necked obstinacy that the chief hindrance lies to the fulfilment of the purpose of election. Because of this hindrance the Messianic salvation appears now as somewhat further postponed. But the certainty that the people of God will yet enjoy this salvation in the glorious consummation of the restored theocracy is not only firmly maintained by the prophets, but is, in view of the impending destruction of Jerusalem, announced with all the more emphatic definiteness.[1] In the extremity of their judicial sufferings, which, according to Jeremiah, are to continue for about seventy years,[2] Jehovah will accomplish His intention of purifying His people and bringing them to full repentance. Then He turns to them again in all the fulness of His grace and faithfulness. Babylon, that has executed His judgment upon all other peoples, must herself finally drink to the dregs the cup of His wrath. With one blow the whole proud edifice of her world-empire falls in pieces. And the shattering of this empire is the deliverance of Jehovah's peculiar people from the misery of the captivity. The forgiveness of their sins,[3] their ethico-religious renewal effected by

[1] Jer. 30–33. [2] Jer. 25. 11 f., 29. 10. [3] Jer. 31. 34, 33. 8, 50. 20.

Jehovah Himself,[1] remove all the hindrances offered by the people themselves to the full accomplishment of Jehovah's saving purpose. They return to the holy land, rebuild the destroyed Jerusalem and the desolated cities of the land, and rejoice once more in the gracious presence of Jehovah in their midst, and His government laden with blessing. The theocracy is restored, and, as so restored, it is *the* Theocracy of the perfect time. Throughout, JEREMIAH brings the dawn of the Messianic era into immediate connexion with the redemption of Israel from the tyranny of the Chaldeans. Throughout, he speaks of the people who have returned to the holy land from the exile as of the community of the perfect time, with whom Jehovah will make the new covenant, on whose hearts He will write His law, and all whose members, great or small, will stand in a like close relation to Him, and be acquainted with Him. Of fresh catastrophes, endangering the kingdom of God, and intervening between the deliverance from the Babylonian exile and the attainment of the final goal, he knows nothing. From the moment of this deliverance God's people are conducted by a straight course and in a short space of time to their glorious destiny.—In the prophecy of Jeremiah's contemporary, EZEKIEL, who himself lived and laboured in the land of captivity, we read, indeed, of such an impending danger as threatening in the "end of the days," and after the reërection of the theocracy. The victory of Jehovah and His kingdom over the

[1] Jer. 24. 7, 29. 12 f., 31. 33, 32. 39 f., 3. 21 ff.

power of the heathen he divides into two acts, considerably distant from each other in point of time. The judgment of God, bringing redemption to Israel, affects immediately only the neighbouring peoples that have already come hitherto into conflict with the theocracy. After Jehovah has exhibited Himself to their eyes as the Holy One, who with a mighty hand redeems His people, the theocracy can be again erected, and there follows for the people of God a time of sure rest and deep peace.[1] But the peoples in the farthest North and South (South-West) have not yet come to know Jehovah's power. They group themselves in the last days round the northern king, Gog, in conflict against Israel. But Jehovah annihilates their numberless troops in the holy land, and casts upon *their* countries a consuming fire of judgment.[2] Only after even the most distant peoples have thus experienced the power of the living God, and been made aware of the inviolable holiness of His Kingdom, is the latter secured from every further attack.[3] But if in this way the "end of the days" is postponed still further, yet even, according to Ezekiel, the leading back of the captive people of God to the holy land indicates the beginning of the perfect time. It is, in fact, just this great deed of Jehovah's grace, done, not for the worthiness of Israel, but for His holy name and truth's sake, which effects for the hardened and blinded people what even their extremity in judgment could not effect, a repentant acknowledgment and remorseful

[1] Ezek. 38. 8. 11 ff. [2] Ezek. 39. 6. [3] Ezek. chaps. 38, 39.

shame of their former disloyalties, and a sincere turning to Jehovah.[1] And, because the faithful covenant-God forgives their sins, purifies them from all their uncleannesses, and gives them a heart of flesh in place of the stony heart,—gives them even *His own* Spirit,—they are made ready for perfect fellowship with Him;[2] and as, further, all the neighbouring peoples have learnt to fear His power and holy majesty, nothing now forbids the restoration of the theocracy in all its final glory. As, with Micah, the Messianic king has already mounted the throne, when the last decisive conflict will burst forth between the theocracy and the heathen world, as, in the *Revelation* of John, the kingdom of Christ has been for a thousand years in existence before Satan is again set free to bring against it the troops of Gog and Magog;[3] so, with Ezekiel also, the people of God have been for long in the enjoyment of perfect fellowship with God and the glory destined for them, before they require to be secured in the blessings of salvation by God's judgment upon the hordes of Gog. To him also the deliverance from captivity and the return to the holy land appear glorified in the dawn-light of the Messianic time.—And yet much more is this the case with the great prophet who lived towards the end of the Exile, and whose prophecies are contained in Isa. chaps. 40–66.

He recognises clearly how thorough a sifting and

[1] Ezek. 16. 61 ff., 20. 43 f., 36. 31 f.
[2] Ezek. 11. 19 f., 16. 63, 36. 25 ff., 37. 23. [3] Rev. 20.

renewal the people of God still require to be able to fulfil their great prophetic mission to humanity, and how, as the servant of Jehovah, Israel must fulfil his martyr-vocation with enduring patience and faithfulness unto death before he can attain his destined glory. His prophecy contains an exceedingly full picture of future historical events, among which are many great deeds of Jehovah's grace and judgment, and many a labour and suffering of the servant of God, lying between the present and the last time, when as a royal and priestly people Israel shall stand between God and humanity,[1] the sworn counsel of Jehovah, that every knee should bow to Him and every tongue swear to Him,[2] be fulfilled, and heaven and earth be renewed and glorified.[3] And yet in the thorough revolution of the whole situation, effected in his time by Cyrus, the anointed of Jehovah, the man chosen by Him to carry out this purpose, Deutero-Isaiah recognises the birth-throes quivering through the world, which announce the speedy dawn of the time of salvation, and after which the perfected Kingdom will come into existence. Throughout, the quite near event of the deliverance of the people of God from the tyranny of Babylon means to him the starting-point whence the onward course of God's saving purpose to its goal of fulfilment is uninterrupted and rapid. The people whom Jehovah in His own Person brings back from the land of captivity through the desert to Canaan—a deliverance in which

[1] Isa. 61. 6, 66. 21. [2] Isa. 45. 22 ff. [3] Isa. 65. 17, 66. 22.

are repeated the deeds of wonder and grace of the Mosaic time—are fitted by the Spirit of God for the fulfilment of their high calling;[1] they are a community of the holy and the righteous; for no unclean person returns to the holy City of God,[2] all the inhabitants of the gloriously restored City will be taught of Jehovah, even as the prophets now are.[3] By the judgment, further, upon the Chaldean empire, and the glorious revelation of Jehovah in the deliverance of His people, the way is prepared even in the Gentile world for the servant of God to fulfil his vocation; the vanity of idols and the sole Godhead of Jehovah become thus manifest before all flesh,[4] as, indeed, his wonderful successes — successes foretold by Jehovah —must even now bring Cyrus to the knowledge of the true God.[5]—In short: Henceforth Jehovah will not again be wroth with His people;[6] henceforth He will not fail to glorify Himself ever more in them in eternal grace, until they shall have come to participate fully in the salvation of their God, and all peoples have been brought into the Kingdom of God.

We might proceed to show how even in the *post-exilian* period, when the promise of Israel's deliverance and the reërection of the theocracy had been indeed fulfilled, while but little of the promised salvation and glory was to be seen as yet, Messianic prophecy

[1] Isa. 42. 1, 44. 3. [2] Isa. 60. 21. [3] Isa. 54. 13.
[4] Isa. 40. 5, 45. 6, 49. 26, 52. 10, 59. 19, 66. 18.
[5] Isa. 45. 3. [6] Isa. 54. 9.

announced afresh the message of the *shortly* coming glorious completion of the theocracy so barely restored, and in so doing, clothed itself in a new times-borrowed garment; how HAGGAI[1] announces the performance within but a short space of a mighty Divine act, shaking heaven and earth, sea and land, and the kingdoms of all peoples, by which all the power of the world-kingdoms shall be destroyed, and all peoples laid under tribute to present to Jehovah the homage of their gold and silver for the adornment of the temple, still so little magnificent, so that its glory be greater than before; how ZECHARIAH singles out the building of the temple into an edifice worthy of the entrance and indwelling of Jehovah as the most important task of the Messias;[2] how MALACHI expects that the coming of Jehovah will be soon and sudden;[3] how *even* in the time of the hard conflict, in which, under the tyrant ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES, Israel had to engage for his ancestral faith and worship, the resurrection of dead Israelites, the judgment of the world and the erection of the Kingdom of heaven upon the ruins of all earthly kingdoms link themselves, in the future-seeing eye of a prophet, to the near impending triumph of the people of God over the fall of the tyrant.[4] But we refrain; for our intention of illustrating by examples how the prophets, in their belief in its nearness, place the Messianic salvation in the

[1] Hag. 2. 6; cp. vv. 21 ff. [2] Zech. 6. 16. [3] Mal. 3. 1. 5.
[4] Dan. 2. 44, 7. 8 f. 11 ff. 21 f. 25 ff., 8. 17, 11. 35. 45, 12. 1 ff., 7. 11 ff.

most immediate and intimate relation to the historical circumstances of their own time and to the events of the immediate future, has been sufficiently fulfilled.

Beyond all question we must recognise a *limit* to the vision of the future granted to the prophets by the Spirit of God, in the fact that they always believed the day of Jehovah and the salvation of the perfect time to be much nearer than they actually were, and that the saving thoughts of God, which should at some future time attain accomplishment, were always present to their consciousness in the veil of features borrowed from their own times. For it cannot be pretended that God would always have actually brought about the accomplishment of His Kingdom in the precise time and manner announced by the prophets, had Israel only fulfilled the ethico-religious conditions attached to the promise. In the counsel of the eternal and omniscient God, from Whom not even Israel's future attitude was concealed, the day and hour of the fulfilment of His saving decree were determined before the foundation of the world; the Saviour could appear only when "the time was fulfilled," and the light that should arise with Him upon the world was, according to the eternal counsel of God, of a much higher kind than the atmosphere of their time allowed to appear to the prophets. Yet this limitation of the prophetic prospect did not imply any *lack* of Divine revelation to the prophets; it was no *flaw* cleaving to Messianic prophecy and disfiguring it. It resulted rather from the *same Divine educative wisdom,* that

concealed from the apostles—has concealed also from us—the day and the hour when the Son of Man will come, but yet bids us observe the signs of the times, and in stedfast watchfulness and readiness, in firm faith and enduring hope, keep our gaze directed to the end of the ways of God. If Messianic prophecy had shown the goal of the history of the Kingdom of God in the long misty distance, wholly separated from the conditions and circumstances of the actual present, it would hardly have been able to exercise any influence upon those to whom yet it was in the first instance vouchsafed. Only by means of its times-coloured character, as above explained, could it fulfil its immediate design of directing the course of the prophets' contemporaries in present perplexities, of being to them a light enabling them to recognise the way, on which God should lead His people in the present and the immediate future, *as one that conducted to the perfect consummation*, and of giving their thoughts and conduct direction towards this goal. Of a solution of the problems of the future that went further there was no need. If only the next piece of the road, reaching to the next turning-point in the history of the Theocracy, were illumined by the light of the Divine purpose, and if men saw in the judgment, actually on the way, the "Judge of the world ever in the act of coming," and in the dawn of the immediately impending time of salvation and grace the "Saviour of the world ever in the act of coming," [1]

[1] Cp. Oehler in *loc. cit.* p. 654.

the first receivers of the Messianic prophecies were fully in a position to pass their life in faith and obedience, in patience and hope, and in their own place work for the coming of the Kingdom of God, without being turned from the right course by the prevalence of unrighteousness within the theocracy, or by the apparent triumph of the heathen world-powers.

The faith, moreover, of a truly pious Israelite was not to be shaken by the fact that the dawn of the perfect time did not happen so soon as the announcements of the prophets might lead him to expect, or that therefore the fulfilment of all the individual details could, in presence of wholly altered circumstances, no longer be expected. And for two reasons: *Firstly,* immediately succeeding events did not leave these details altogether unfulfilled. Just as the prophecy of the world-judgment in Isa. 2 was in some sense fulfilled in the judgment which first the allied Syrians and Ephraimites and then the Assyrians executed upon Israel, the Messianic prophecy of Isaiah found at least a relative fulfilment in the deliverance of the people of God from the danger threatening them from Assyria, as did also that of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the "Great Unknown" in the redemption and return of the captives and the reërection of the theocracy. And even although this times-adapted fulfilment seemed but a comparatively small beginning of the great events which prophecy had placed in near prospect, it was yet necessarily regarded as a pledge that God was but keeping the full carrying out of

His saving thoughts concerning Israel, announced by the prophets, safely in store for the succeeding time. *Secondly*, and this the *other* reason, the godly Israelites always and necessarily recognised in their own guilt and in the people's unfaithfulness the hindrance, because of which the holy and righteous God still kept from them the perfect fulness of the promised salvation. And, indeed, the prophets themselves when the good times announced by their predecessors have actually commenced, and so soon as Israel has incurred the guilt of a fresh defection, open up prospects of new and severer judgments which are to precede the perfect salvation.—Hence also we find that the later prophets recognised the utterances of their predecessors as genuine Divine messages, while the later Jews gave similar recognition to all the prophetic writings contained in the Old Testament canon, although they must have known that the Messianic salvation did not appear so soon as, or in the way in which, it seemed justifiable from the actual tenor of the words to expect.[1]

II. In what we have advanced hitherto there has been nothing like a complete exhibition of the connexion between history and Messianic prophecy. The historical circumstances of the varying present exercise a qualifying and determining influence upon the contents of the latter that cuts much deeper still—an influence that effects even its innermost kernel, that eternal ideal

[1] Cp. Bertheau in *loc. cit.* vol. iv. p. 625.

substance that is enclosed in a times-form. We have in this reference to direct special attention to *two* points.

1. In the organism of the Old Testament theocracy there were various factors which exercised a determining influence upon the formation of the circumstances and conditions that either coincided with or contradicted the will of God, and upon the course of the theocratic development: the congregation, the priesthood, and prophets;[1] the common people, the princes and judges (or, in general, the nobility), and the kingship. The influence of the different offices and ranks upon the constitution of public life and the course of historical development did not remain in the course of the centuries always the same. It imparted itself in different measures at different times to the separate factors. According to the historical situation, the hopes for the continuance and prosperity of the theocracy necessarily attached themselves, in greater degree, now to the one, now to the other. It could not but be that in the consciousness and thought-world of the prophets also those factors, which, in their time, exercised little influence upon the course of affairs, receded into the background; while, on the other hand, their regard was chiefly directed to, and their thoughts principally occupied with, that factor which exercised a preponderating influence upon the life of the nation and the concerns of the theocracy as regarded the present and the immediate future.

The different situations occupied by the Israelites at

[1] *Prophetenstand.*

the different stages of their history, involved further that the special attention of the prophets, as well as of the people and their princes, was turned now to the relation of the theocracy to the heathen world-empires, or the relation of Judah to the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, now to the internal condition of the kingdom as a whole, or to matters of religious ritual or of civil law, or to one or other particular national and theocratic problem. The central points round which the genuinely national and theocratic interests and efforts revolved, were, of course, always equally the central points of prophetic interest. Both these circumstances were necessarily of far-reaching importance as regards the constitution of Messianic prophecy. A special consequence was, that now one set of ideas, now another, all containing germs of Messianic apprehensions, assumed supreme importance in the prophetic consciousness,—now the idea of the congregation of Jehovah, now that of the kingdom of God, now that of the theocratic kingship, now that of the priesthood, now that of the enduring presence of God in the temple. In virtue, further, of the organic, *i.e.* the psychologically-mediated, origin of the Messianic prophecies, those germs that were specially prominent in the consciousness of particular prophets necessarily came, so far as these prophets were concerned, to be developed in preference to others. Hence we see that in the course of its historical development Messianic prophecy always chooses as the source of its ideas that fountain of Old Testament revelations which the special cir-

cumstances of the time cause to gush forth in greatest abundance, and that it points to the salvation of the perfect time, now from this principal point of departure, now from that. Here a germ of Messianic truth remains for long, like the seed-corn that slumbers hidden in the earth, until at last the historical circumstances emerge in which it can come to light and prove its living motive-force. There, on the other hand, another comes under favouring circumstances rapidly to maturity, and unfolds shortly the richest and fairest blossoms; then, however, comes a stoppage: its motive-power seems to abate, and finally to die away, until, perchance, when the historical circumstances have again become favourable to its development, fresh aftergrowths of motive-power prove that its life is not exhausted yet. The law which in this relation governs the development of Messianic prophecy, we may, however, formulate as follows: *The prophets make particular factors in the organism of the Old Testament theocracy the objects of their Messianic oracles, in proportion as they are able, in their time, to exercise a decisive influence upon the realisation of the idea of the Kingdom of God, and similarly they concern themselves with the different national and theocratic interests, according to the measure of importance which they have in the circumstances of the actual present for the Kingdom of God. In different periods consequently, of the history of the Old Covenant, now one and now another of the ideas contained in the Old Testament religion, and embodied in the Old Testament theocracy, forms the principal*

starting-point of Messianic prophecy, and the principal source of its peculiar content.

We shall endeavour to illustrate and prove this position more in detail. In doing so we glance first of all at the history of the development of Messianic prophecy in the *narrower sense* of the phrase—that, viz., which has grown from the idea of the *theocratic kingship*. With JOEL the Messianic king has found as yet no place in the picture of the perfected Kingdom. His prophecy is still a product of the common soil of the ideas of the *people* and the *kingdom of God;* and the end which the community is to attain through the perfecting of its fellowship with Jehovah, is represented to him in the phenomenon, *prophecy*. When the gift of prophecy has become a common possession of all, the goal is reached.[1] With the succeeding prophets the oracle of the appearance of the Messianic king is *in the moment of birth*. AMOS associates the dawn of the perfect time with the restoration of the *Davidic kingship* in its former power and glory; but he does not speak of the person of the Messias; in other respects, too, his prophecy is very undeveloped, for the perfection of the Kingdom consists, according to him, principally in the permanent restoration of a state of things that has already existed. In the happy times of David and Solomon his ideal of the Kingdom of God was already all but fulfilled.[2] The Davidic kingship has the same position in the prophecy of HOSEA; apart from it, he also is unable to conceive the Kingdom of the perfect

[1] Joel 2. 28 f. [2] Amos 9. 11 f.

time. The conversion of Ephraim to Jehovah means also his return to allegiance to the Davidic king;[1] the latter is not yet, however, called the Messias. We can hardly be wrong in interpreting this appearance of the Davidic kingship within the circle of Messianic prospect as the effect of the very promising fresh exaltation of the idea which began with the reign of Uzziah—a king, adorned with all the virtues of a ruler, as pious as he was energetic.[2] Amos and Hosea clearly recognised that, in spite of the passing prosperity it enjoyed again under Jeroboam II., the kingdom of the Ten Tribes was on the sure way to ruin. For the evils, however, which inevitably brought about this result, the kingship, which, amid all changes in the royal line, kept, even in its better times, to the ways of Jeroboam I., who "made Israel to sin," was chiefly responsible.[3] The kingdom of Judah, on the other hand, not merely rose again to a position of external prestige and power, such as it had not known since the disruption from the other tribes, but, in spite of the fact that the prophets still found enough to reprove and to threaten with punishment, its internal condition

[1] Hos. 1. 11, 3. 5. In Hos. 1. 11 the variously interpreted *wᵉʿālu min-Hāʾārĕṣ* (and they shall come up from the land) is to our thinking to be understood as referring to the festive convoy which all the people give to the king of their common choice on his entry into the palace (cp. the parallel in 1 Kings 1. 35. 40). Simson's exegesis is therefore substantially correct (cp. on this passage).

[2] Cp. on him: Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iii. pp. 585 ff. (Eng. Trans. vol. iv. pp. 143 ff.); and Eisenlohr, *Das Volk Israel unter der Herrschaft der Könige*, vol. ii. pp. 204 ff.

[3] Cp. 2 Kings 14. 24, 15. 9.

also, so far as the influence and powerful rule of the pious king extended, assumed a hopeful aspect. Men experienced again what a blessing for the theocracy the much more firmly rooted kingship of Jehovah's chosen Davidic house was; to it Judah owed at least the greatest proportion of the reasons of its superiority over the kingdom of the Ten Tribes. In its full restitution, consequently, prophecy recognises one of the most essential conditions of the perfection of the theocracy. The facts, moreover, that both Amos and Hosea have principally in view the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, and that a Davidic king, such as in their time adorned the throne, seemed competent to set aside the calf worship of Ephraim, and to restore the unity and greatness of the theocracy, made it all the easier for these prophets to content themselves with the merely general conception of the Davidic kingship.

The Messianic king himself we meet with first of all in the prophecy of a younger contemporary of Hosea, the author of Zech. 9–11. He tells[1] of the Messias making his peaceful entry into Jerusalem amid the plaudits of the people, and depicts the character of his person and rule. As God Himself is *tsaddîḳ umôshîʿa* (a just one and a Saviour),[2] so is this king as His representative upon earth *tsaddîḳ wᵉnôshāʿ* (just and *saved*, R.V. margin); his kingly action is in entire harmony with the standard of the Divine will, and therefore Jehovah grants him at all

[1] Zech. 9. 9 f. [2] Isa. 45. 21.

times—and *through him the people*—salvation.[1] He is, further, humble and meek (*ʿāni*), far from all self-exaltation and violence in his bearing to others. Exaltation and humility, the fulness of God-granted power, and the meekest, most peaceful disposition are united in him. Without any of the martial implements of power in use in the kingdoms of the world, —implements previously removed by God's judgment from His Kingdom, — he effects peace among the nations by his mere word. And the blessed rule of this highly-honoured, Divinely-powerful king of peace extends from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. Not long after the delineation of this picture[2] we see the prophecy of the Messianic king *reaching, in the main, the culminating point of its development in* Isaiah and his contemporary Micah. Both prophets associate with his appearance the dawn of the Messianic time, and point to him as the perfecter of the theocracy. Both speak of him as of a *human* king, whose person, however, is wonderful, who in virtue of his *unique relation to God* stands *high above all other men*, as the organ through whom God Himself accomplishes His saving purpose as the mediator of the Messianic salvation for the people of God and for humanity. In the time of Ahaz, Isaiah[3]

[1] Cp. Jer. 23. 6, Deut. 33. 29.

[2] We assume that Zech. chaps. 10 and 11 belong to the time of Pekah, Zech. 9 to a somewhat earlier date. On the discussion lately raised afresh by Stade (*Zeitsch. für die alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1881, pp. 1 ff.; 1882, pp. 151 ff. and 275 ff.) as to the date of these prophecies, we cannot here enter.

[3] Isa. 9. 6 f.

depicts him as a king, who, in a degree extraordinary and surpassing human insight, knows to devise always and for everything the best counsel; there is something Divinely wonderful in his counsel-creating energy.[1] Because, further, God Himself makes him, like the angel of Jehovah, the organ of His self-revelation, accomplishes through him His mighty deeds of power, and is, in and through him, *with* His people, he is called "mighty God"—a designation applied elsewhere[2] to Jehovah Himself. We must bear in mind the strictness with which Old Testament faith maintains the transcendence of the holy God above every creature, to estimate aright the unique and intimate relation to God ascribed to the Messianic king by this transference to him of a Divine name. He is further characterised as the everlasting fatherly provider for the people of God,[3] and—as in Zech. 9—the prince of peace. His Messianic work of salvation, however, consists in delivering the people of God from the yoke of the Assyrians, in destroying all the implements of war[4] and establishing eternal peace, in confirming and enlarging the dominion of the Davidic kingship, and causing perfect equity and righteousness to prevail in the kingdom of God.[5] Still more minute

[1] *Pēlĕ' yōēts;* cp. Isa. 28. 29, where it is said of God *hiphlī' 'ētsāh.*

[2] Cp. Isa. 10. 21, Deut. 10. 17, Jer. 32. 18.

[3] Cp. Isa. 22. 21 ff. together with Hab. 3. 3 ff.

[4] That both these functions belong to the Messias we infer from the *ki* (for) of Isa. 9. 6, and from the reference to the "day of Midian" in ver. 4.

[5] "Righteousness and judgment" are the foundation of God's throne, therefore also the foundation of Messias' throne (cp. Ps. 89. 14).

is Isaiah's characterisation of the person and government of the Messias in a prophecy belonging to the time of Hezekiah.[1] On him, as on no other, rests the Spirit of the Jehovah, supplying him with those gifts and qualifications that fit him to be the organ by whom Jehovah Himself conducts the government of His kingdom—with the knowledge and fear of God, with wisdom for government, with Divinely-effective energy. His main endeavour is that his people should fear Jehovah; his delight is in the fear of God. In his judicial decisions he does not judge according to the outward appearance nor according to human testimony; his sure insight penetrates rather always the thing itself and the human heart; he judges according to the real state of the case, and according to men's moral and religious worth. His exercise of justice is not impaired by human weakness; it is exercised by God's Spirit through him in such a way that in judging men he applies the very standard according to which Jehovah Himself judges. He secures their lawful rights, in particular, to the poor and needy; but his mere word is sufficient to strike down the violent and to slay the wicked. Thus he reigns as a king, whose fairest adornment is righteousness and faithfulness towards God and man. Thus, further, by his rule the theocracy becomes, what it is intended to be, a kingdom in which evil no longer happens, and none does hurt to another,—a kingdom filled with the living knowledge of Jehovah, and

[1] Isa. 11. 1 ff.

therefore with righteousness and peace. In relation also to its extent, the theocracy becomes through him what it is intended to be. His place of abode becomes the metropolis of all kingdoms, all nations pay him homage, and obtain from him the decision of all controversies—advice, direction. He is therefore the mediator of the Messianic saving work of Jehovah depicted in Isa. 2. 1 ff., by which the nations learn the law of God, and the earth becomes a kingdom of peace.—A precisely similar picture of the Messianic king is drawn by MICAH.[1] After God's judgment has gone forth against both Jerusalem and the royal house of David, the latter will once again be lifted up out of the deepest humiliation and obscurity to the highest power and honour. The Messianic branch will spring, like David, from its ancient stem[2]—from the small, unpretentious Bethlehem. In the restitution of the Davidic kingship ancient history repeats itself, just as in the restitution of the people, by their being led out of the land of captivity. This Messianic king, moreover, will, as the organ and viceroy of Jehovah, the shepherd of Israel, fulfil the part of a shepherd of the people of God, clothed with the almighty power of Jehovah; and his rule will be such, that *in* and *through* it God's great name—*i.e.*

[1] Micah 5. 2 ff.

[2] In this sense, in contrast partly with the unpretentious place of birth, partly with the succession of upstarts in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, the words *umōtsā'othāv mikkedhem mīmē 'ōlām* ("whose goings forth," etc.) are to be understood. Cp. EWALD and HITZIG on Micah 5. 2. The objection, that all Israelites were of like ancient origin, is ill-considered. Do not we also speak of an "old family"?

the glory of that which God Himself is to His people —becomes manifest. Passing by other features in Micah's description, let us now ask: How did it come about that just these prophets should have been forward to develop, almost as perfectly as they have been developed anywhere in Old Testament times, the truths regarding the saving purpose and sovereign plan of God that are involved in the idea of the theocratic kingship?—It might be answered: Once this idea had come within the circle of the Messianic hopes, the prophets must soon have become conscious of the contradiction between it and the historical kingship, and thus the more general prophecy of the Davidic kingship of the perfect time would necessarily transform itself into the more definite prophecy of a Davidic Messias. This explanation, however, cannot suffice of itself. If this were peculiarly the cause of the development of Messianic prophecy in the narrower sense, why does the latter not come *then* specially to the forefront, when the contradiction is at its height? Why not in the time of an Ahaz much rather than in the time of a Hezekiah?[1] And why is it that, as we shall see, the image of the Messianic king fades away just during the reigns of the last kings of Judah?

[1] Delitzsch, indeed, asserts that this was actually the case—but in contradiction with the facts. Cp. Oehler, art. "Messias," in Herzog's *Realencyklopädie*, 1st ed. p. 414. In the 2nd ed. von Orelli has removed the remarks relative to this point, doubtless because he agrees with Delitzsch in assigning Isa. 11 to the time of Ahaz (cp. his work, *Die alttest. Weissagung*)—an hypothesis which I consider quite unreliable.

We can find the reason of this rapid and rich development of the prophecy of the Messianic king only in the greater importance which, in consequence of the complications of the theocracy with the Assyrian world-power, the Davidic kingship won for the former. These complications were, for the whole course of the history of the theocracy, much more fatal than the earlier conflicts with neighbouring peoples. During them, however, the burden of decision lay principally with the kingship. The fate and position of the kingdom depended mainly upon the character of the king's rule, upon his policy and attitude (of dependence or independence) towards the Assyrians. We see, indeed, how, according to Isa. 7, the fatal choice made by Ahaz at the decisive moment rendered the threatening judgment inevitable; how, according to Isa. 32, Hezekiah's inclination to defer rather to the advice of his magnates, who urged an alliance with Egypt, than to the will of Jehovah, threatens to bring about yet greater disaster; and how, on the contrary, his unreserved decision for Jehovah is the salvation of the kingdom. No wonder that at such a time the eyes of the prophets were directed chiefly to the kingship. The theocracy meets the Assyrian world-power principally in the person of its king, in whom its power is concentrated, and who is its representative abroad. Hence Messianic prophecy begins from this point to make the accomplishment of the Kingdom, in spite of the obstacles thrown in its way by the Assyrian world-power, depend mainly upon the coming

of *the* son of David, in whom the theocratic kingship should *actually* become what it ideally is.—It would be easy to show in detail, particularly from Isa. 9 and Micah 5, how the Messianic kingship is expressly represented by the prophets as the institution by means of which the theocracy of the perfect time is able to exalt itself in victorious *defiance of the Assyrian world-power.*

That, moreover, the prophets, once they had set themselves to depict the Messianic king, should give prominence to the point that under his rule righteousness and judgment should have full sway in the internal affairs of the theocracy, and that the universal acknowledgment and worship of Jehovah should be powerfully promoted, resulted almost unavoidably from their perception of the scanty result attending the well-meant efforts of Hezekiah in this direction.

Let us mark now the further development of the prophecy concerning the Messianic king. The later prophets testify unmistakably to an arrest lasting up to the time of the Exile. The Messias indeed meets us in JEREMIAH at the end of an oracle (belonging to the time of Jehoiachin) on the wicked and hapless kings Jehoahaz, Jehoiachim, and Jehoiachin,[1] and in the promises of salvation issued shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem,[2] as also in EZEKIEL.[3] But he is no longer, as with Isaiah and Micah, in the centre of the picture which these prophets draw of the perfected Kingdom; and there is hardly a new idea,

[1] Jer. 23. 5 f. [2] Jer. 30. 9. 21, 33. 15. [3] 21. 27, 34. 23 f., 37. 24.

except perhaps one, new at least as to form,—that, viz., implied in the characterisation of the intimate relation of the Messianic king to Jehovah as a priestly one.[1] On the other hand, there are in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, besides these passages, other Messianic prophecies, in which again, as with Amos, mention is no longer made of the person of the Messias, but only of the successive kings of the Davidic line.[2] Messianic prophecy in the narrower sense relapses in these passages to its initial stage of development. Indeed, other prophets of the Chaldean period, as ZEPHANIAH, the author of ZECH. 12–14, OBADIAH, and the author of ISA. 24–27, do not mention the kingship of the Messianic theocracy at all,—a distinct proof that the idea of the theocratic kingship had, in the consciousness of the godly of that time, lost much of its significance for the theocracy. As opposed to it, the idea of the people of God again constitutes the principal starting-point and source of the Messianic prophecy of this time. Does not this arrest or even retrogression in the development of the prophecy, that grew from the idea of the theocratic kingship, hang together with the fact that the power and influence of the kingship continued visibly to decline? The fortune and position of the theocracy were no longer dependent to the same extent as in the Assyrian period upon the king. Even a godly king like Josiah could at most postpone only for a

[1] Jer. 30. 21.

[2] Cp. Jer. 17. 25, 22. 4, 33. 17. 21 f. 26, Ezek. 17. 22 ff., 45. 8, 46. 16 ff.

while—he could not avert—the ruin that threatened the state.[1] The last kings did, indeed, their best to destroy the theocracy, and to hasten the ruin of the state. But the kingdom was already practically at the disposal of the powers that were contending for the world-supremacy. Even the kings themselves were, in part, raised to the throne by these powers, Jehoiachim by Pharaoh Necho, Zedekiah by Nebuchadnezzar, of whom the former brought to a rapid close the reign of Jehoahaz, the latter that of Jehoiachin. Those who had the interests of the theocracy at heart could no longer regard a kingship that lay at the disposal of the governors of heathen empires as the main pillar of support for the building of the theocracy. Least of all, when the king showed himself, like Zedekiah, powerless and irresolute in presence even of his own magnates. The Book of Jeremiah reveals distinctly how greatly this king feared to rouse the great men of the kingdom against himself by following his better impulses.[2] The circumstance that, owing to the historical situation, the kingship was no longer the factor that determined the course of the history, is the reason why the Messianic prophecy of this period no longer places in the forefront the perfecting of the kingship in the person of the Messias as the principal condition of the perfected theocracy, but represents rather—in so far as the Messias is mentioned at all—"the kingship of the Davidic house, glorified by Divine

[1] Cp. 2 Kings 22. 15 ff. 23. 26 f., Jer. 15. 4.
[2] Cp. *e.g.* Jer. 37. 17, 38. 14 ff.

graces and gifts, only as an appendix to the other blessings which fall to the lot of the favoured people." [1]

In the time of the Exile the hopes and prospects of salvation free themselves entirely from connexion with the Davidic kingship. In Isa. 40–66,—that "gospel before the gospel,"—in which the Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament reaches what is, in many respects, the height of its development, there is *no* mention *anywhere* of the future Messianic king. Not even in Isa. 55. 3–5, where, on the contrary, the "sure mercies of David" are rather expressly assigned to the people.[2] —At this time, when the theocratic state had collapsed and the ritual of sacrifice had ceased, neither the kingship nor the priesthood, but only genuine prophecy, could be the centre of Israel's national and religious life, or be regarded as the vital factor insuring the continuance and regeneration of the Kingdom of God. To it the eyes of all who waited for the promised salvation necessarily turned, when they sought a God-given pledge of their hope. Prophecy was not, however, a secure and stable institution. The gift and office of prophecy were attached only to the *persons* of those whom Jehovah had called, and not even several isolated historical personages—much less one—could be regarded as the bearers of the Messianic salvation. Their position in the theocracy rested,

[1] Cp. Bertheau in *loc. cit.* vol. iv. p. 684.

[2] Cp. *in loco*, on the one hand, 2 Sam. 7. 8 ff., Ps. 18. 43 ff. 50; and, on the other, Isa. 43. 10, 44. 8.

however, on the fact, that as the chief representatives of the idea of the people of God they were before others possessed and illumined by the Spirit of God: and the gift of the Spirit was promised to the whole community. Hence all the Messianic prospects begin now to connect themselves with the idea of the people of God, in such a way, however, that the latter come to be regarded as an organ of Jehovah, entrusted with a prophetic calling to humanity. The part of the Messianic king, endowed with the fulness of God-given might and sovereign power, and triumphing victoriously over all enemies, is assumed by the people, the servant of Jehovah, who fulfils amid shame and persecution his prophetic witness-vocation with immovable faithfulness, with enduring patience, and with strong faith and hope, and goes through suffering to glory. He it is who is now the central figure of the picture of the perfect time. He is the organ through whom God reërects in glorified form His Kingdom upon earth, and brings to pass His saving purpose concerning entire humanity.[1]

So soon, on the other hand, as the theocratic state is externally restored, and, in the person of Zerubbabel, a prince of the house of David stands at its head as one of its principal supports, we find that with

[1] It will not appear surprising that the Messianic king finds no place in the picture of the perfect time sketched by Deutero-Isaiah, if it is remembered that the omission implies only a reassumption on the part of prophecy, in more complicated form, of the ancient Mosaic and more ideal conception, which represents Jehovah's rule over the entire people as immediate (cp. pp. 103 f.).

HAGGAI[1] and ZECHARIAH[2] the prophecy of the Messianic king immediately revives, and receives, in fact, a new shape from the hand of the latter prophet after a manner peculiarly his own, to which we shall recur further on. With MALACHI, on the contrary, in whose time there was no longer a Davidic prince, it again disappears, in order finally—not as a natural product of the times, *but only as the result of an acquaintance with prophetic writings that have come to be regarded as Holy Scriptures* —to flash forth once again in the Book of DANIEL, and shed yet another clear light upon the superhuman character of the person of the Messias. For, when there had been for long no native kingship, and the house of David was sunk in obscurity, when, nevertheless, ancient prophecy had left the expectation of a Messianic king indelibly rooted in the hearts of the people, this book announces the Messias no longer definitely as an offspring of the family of David, but characterises him as a person in human form, who indeed belongs as their royal head to the saints of the Most High, but whose descent remains concealed in the darkness of mystery, while his superhuman character manifests itself in the fact that, like Jehovah Himself, the Son of man comes on the clouds of heaven, to be invested by God with the eternal Kingship over a Theocracy reared upon the ruins of all the kingdoms of the world.[3]

[1] Hag. 2. 21 ff.,—a passage which, according to the analogy of Gen. 12. 3, cp. with Gen. 18. 18, 22. 18, is to be understood, not merely of the person of Zerubbabel, but of him and his family.

[2] Zech. 3. 8 ff., 6. 9 ff.

[3] Dan. 7. 13 f. It is notoriously a matter of dispute whether the

Thus far our glance at the course of the development of the prophecy of the Messianic king has confirmed the propositions we laid down. They

figure resembling a *son of man* is, in the prophet's intention, the Messias, or whether—as particularly Hitzig *in loco*, and Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. pp. 209 f.; *Schriftbeweis* (1st ed.) ii. 2, pp. 541 f., assume—the prophet means merely to give a symbolical representation of "the people of the saints of the Most High." The latter view seems able to support itself upon the author's own testimony in vv. 18, 22, and 27; and it must be allowed that the *kebhar 'ĕnāsh* (like a son of man) corresponds with the *k'aryēh* (like a lion), ver. 4, and the *kin'mar* (like a leopard), ver. 6, in such a way as to oppose the *man*-forms to the *brute*-forms, representing the world-monarchies, —a circumstance which makes it natural to regard the former, not as a personal individual, but as a typico-visionary representation of another kind of dominion. If this view were correct, we should have to concede that with Daniel also, as with Malachi, the form of the Messianic king recedes into dimness, and hence that a character entirely in keeping with the circumstances of the times belongs to his prophecy.—We consider, however, the old and prevalent interpretation of the passage to be the right one—that, viz., which is presupposed in the Book of Enoch (46. 1, 48. 2 ff., 62. 5. 7, 69. 27. 29) and in the Fourth Book of Ezra (13. 1 ff. 12. 32 ff.), and which refers the passage to the Messias. Besides the merely typical figures, the vision represents also persons, who appear without figurative veil; this is true specially of the heavenly judgment-scene, in which the description—apart from the reference to the beasts in vv. 11 and 12—loses its figurative-allegorical character. This of itself makes it probable that he who appears in human form before God is no mere typical figure, but a real personality. And it is confirmed by the fact—to which Auberlen has already directed attention (*Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis*, 2nd ed. pp. 51 f.)—that ver. 21 makes it necessary to distinguish the saints of the Most High from the Son of man. It would be, to say the least, a striking incongruity if it were there (in ver. 21) presupposed that the saints were to be seen in the vision *before* the judgment-scene as the object of persecution from the little horn, and yet were to be regarded also as represented in the typical figure of the Son of man, whose appearance has already been represented with the greatest emphasis in ver. 13 as *astoundingly* new, and as taking place in the course of the judgment-scene and after the accomplishment of the judgment upon the beasts. Add to this, that it could hardly be said of the holy people that they came "with (*i.e.* upon) the clouds of

receive, however, a much more obvious confirmation, if we remark the time and historical circumstances in which the idea of the *priesthood* comes to have a

heaven." The circumstance that God's judgment-seat is in heaven cannot justify this expression (*contra* Kamphausen in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*); it would supply at best only a reason for representing the Son of man as elevated to heaven; moreover, the scene of the judgment is, to all appearance, not heaven but earth, to which the Ancient of days (ver. 22) and the Son of man descend. A more feasible argument would be that implied in Hitzig's reference to Dan. 8. 10, according to which the nation of saints (ver. 24) are to the seer of the vision the host of the stars in the heavens. But even thus the peculiar loftiness of the expression, which is used elsewhere only of God (Isa. 19. 1, Ps. 104. 3), does not seem sufficiently justified. It must be allowed to be designed to express that superhuman, Divine character of the appearing one, which would not certainly be inferred from the *k*ᵉ in *kᵉbhar 'ĕnāsh* (*vid. supra*). But this can be only the Messianic king, who stands at the head of the saints of the Most High, the representative and organ beside and under the Prince of the host of heaven (8. 11), and who, according to the but slightly younger Third Book of the Sibyllines, vv. 286 f. (where the reference, as Hilgenfeld, *Jüd. Apokalyptik*, pp. 81 ff., has rightly contended, is not to Cyrus), is sent by God *ouranóthen* (from heaven), and according to vv. 286 ff. *ap' ēelioio* (from the sun)—quite improperly rendered by some "from the East." In him the Messianic kingdom comes from above, from the God of heaven, and is destined to embrace the whole earth (Dan. 2. 34 ff. 44 f.), and through him as their head the saints of the Most High also receive kingdom and dominion (7. 18. 22. 27). That the Messias should be conceived as in heaven and coming thence, would be most easily explained if, as Oehler (art. "Messias" in Herzog's *Realencycl.* p. 417; *Theol. des Alt. Test.* ii. pp. 144 and 265) and Hilgenfeld (in *loc. cit.* pp. 47 ff.) think, it could be proved that in the Book of Daniel—esp. 10. 5 ff.—the conceptions of the angel of Jehovah and of the Messias are combined. Proof, however, fails; even the *kidhᵉmuth bᵉnē 'ādhām* (like the image of the sons of men) and *kᵉmar'ēh 'ādhām* (like the appearance of a man) in the description of the angel is no proper parallel to the *kᵉbhar 'ĕnāsh* of 7. 13. Its true parallel is the expression *dᵉmuth kᵉmar'ēh 'ādhām* used by Ezekiel (1. 26) in the description of the theophany. There is nothing in the former of the two supposed parallels to remind us of the Son of man. Besides, if he were conceived as an angelic personality, vv. 18, 22, and 27 of chap. 7 could hardly take his fellowship

greater importance for Messianic prophecy. Throughout the entire pre-Exilian period the priest, it is true, receives mention now and then in the delineation of the theocracy of the perfect time,[1] but never, not even in EZEKIEL, is any coöperation in the accomplishment

(*Zugehörigkeit*) with the saints of the Most High so completely for granted. As little feasible is the suggestion of Hitzig, that the basis of this conception of the Son of man lies in the more developed belief in immortality, and that he is to be identified with David, leading a heavenly life after death. Without unjustifiable dogmatising, however, neither the Divinity of the Messias nor yet the conception of an *anthrōpos epourānios* (heavenly man) (BEYSCHLAG, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testamentes*, p. 13), who has preëxisted as a supra-terrestrial being, can be extracted from the passage. The prophet gives no indication as to the origin of the Son of man; he presupposes only his fellowship (*Zugehörigkeit*) with the saints of the Most High. The basis of the conception that he is in heaven and comes thence is no relation to God or men founded upon his origin or nature — in short, no metaphysical *Theologoumenon* whatsoever. It is simply the appropriateness of the description itself, in view of the position in the theocracy assigned to the Messias in the eternal counsel of God; in other words, it is the idea of the theocratic or (as in some cases) Messianic kingship handed down from the elder prophecy; he is conceived as being in heaven and coming thence *only because* he is the representative and organ of the God of heaven, and to him, as such, the superhuman character and the Divine position and dignity—lent, as it were, by God—are really appropriate, which according to Isa. 14. 14 the insolent king of Babylon would fain claim for himself. Be it finally remarked that we do not consider the main argument for the view we have rejected—extracted as it is from 7. 18. 22. 27—as decisive, for *this* among other reasons, because vv. 13 f.—in so far as here the text loses its figurative-allegorical character—did not, like the pictures of the beasts, the ten horns, and the little horn, require special explanation (at least in the same way), whereas prominence had necessarily to be given to the fact that the saints of God, who had been for a time in the power of the tyrant Antiochus, would finally reign over all the kingdoms of the world. How a view which requires us to suppose the reappearance of the picture of the Messias in a kingless time can be reconciled with the nature of prophecy, is shown above.

[1] *E.g.* Jer. 31. 14, 33. 18 ff.

of the Divine purpose of salvation assigned to the priesthood. The reason of this lies in the fact that the priesthood—assigned from the first the duty of conserving religious custom, and the legally ordained constitution of the national worship—did not during the time of the kings exercise any very marked influence upon the historical course of the theocracy. Even the exception we may make in favour of the influence for a short time exercised by the high priests Jehoiada[1] and Hilkiah[2] must be qualified by the remembrance that the interference of these men in the fortunes of the kingdom was due, not so much to their official dignity, as to their personal energy,—albeit the latter was seconded by the former.—When, further, the Messianic prophecy of the time of the Exile represents the people of God, on the attainment of their destined goal, as a priestly people mediating between God and the rest of humanity,[3] the starting-point of this announcement is, without doubt, substantially the idea of Jehovah's peculiar people, as in Ex. 19. 6, and *not* the idea of the special Levitical priesthood. Still, the priests (specially the high priest), as the pure sanctified mediatorial representatives before Jehovah of the congregation entrusted with the office of expiation, were *túpoi tón mellónton* (types of things to come). In the priesthood also there lay a germ of Messianic truth, capable of being developed. This germ actually was developed *in the time immediately succeeding the return from the Exile.* The rebuilding of

[1] 2 Kings, chaps. 11 and 12. [2] 2 Kings 22. [3] Isa. 61. 6, 66. 21.

the temple and the restoration of the temple worship formed at this time the centre of all national and theocratic interests and efforts. On these objects, according to prophecy, the concern of God Himself for His people was now concentrated. By guaranteeing the completion of the building of the temple, Jehovah guaranteed also the continuance and the future perfection of the theocracy. At such a time the priesthood had a much greater importance than formerly for the future of the theocracy. But, in particular, the high priest Joshua occupies a position of independent importance side by side with the Davidic Zerubbabel, such as high priest never before enjoyed in relation to the king; and both work in harmonious zeal, encouraged by prophetic promises, at the building of the dwelling-place of God and the restitution of the theocracy. These historical circumstances are reflected in Messianic prophecy. The priests, whose official character is purity and holiness, and who, in virtue of their office, may draw near to Jehovah, now become the pretypes of the congregation of the perfect time, who are purified from their sins, are holy, and have priestly access to Jehovah; and, in particular, the high priest becomes a type of the Messias who stands at the head of this community.[1] The Messias is thus definitely conceived as a priest-king, not, of course, because he is to offer sacrifices and expiate the people's guilt, but only because he is, in a special degree, a sanctified person, and, as belonging to God, is entitled

[1] Zech. 3. 8 ff., 6. 11 ff.

to immediate priestly access to Him, and because he is the head and representative of a holy, priestly people, purified from sin and guilt. It is with reference to precisely this function that the high priest Joshua, and not the Davidic Zerubbabel, is made the type of the Messias. But there is yet another reason for the preference.—The prophet Zechariah does not, as is usually supposed, mean to announce that the Messias will *unite* in his person the kingly and the high priestly office. Rather he shows us *the Messianic high priest alongside of* the Messianic king in the perfected Kingdom, the former sitting beside the latter on the royal throne, and both working together—as at that time Zerubbabel and Joshua actually did—in harmonious coöperation for the weal of the people of God and in the interest of the theocracy. The prophet, indeed, represents the rule of the Messianic kingdom as emphatically a unity, and as a government by king and high priest; but this unity is not effected by the union of both offices in one person, but by the elevation of the high priest to the throne of the Messias, and by the perfect oneness of mind and spirit, in which the Messianic king and the Messianic high priest conduct their common government.[1] And it is precisely this relationship of close alliance and community in rule,

[1] Zech. 6. 13. Against the prevalent interpretation—again defended even by KÖHLER (*Die nachexilischen Propheten*), KEIL, PRESSEL, KÜPER (in *loc. cit.* pp. 414 f.) VON ORELLI (in *loc. cit.* pp. 499 ff.),—of the words *wᵉhāyāh khohēn ʿal-kiṣ'ō:* "and he (the Messias) shall be a priest on his throne," the concluding words, "and the counsel of peace (*i.e.* harmonious coöperation) shall be between them both," are decisive. For the sense of this clause cannot be: "The Messias, in whom king

in which the high priesthood will stand to the kingship, that is meant to be indicated in the fact that Joshua, and not Zerubbabel, is made the type of the Messias.—Even in the prophecy of MALACHI it is clear that the priesthood still occupies a comparatively important position in the circle of Messianic expectations. In the censures of this prophet special atten-

and priest have become one, shall conceive and accomplish a scheme of helping the *people of God* to peace," which is contrary to the plain sense of *bēn-shenēchĕm* (between them *two*). The concluding sentence speaks distinctly of *two persons*, and therefore the disputed words—in spite of the surprising *wᵉhāyāh*, instead of the more-to-be-expected *wᵉyāshabh*, which, however, had preceded, and therefore was hardly available—can only, with EWALD, HITZIG, BERTHEAU, and STÄHELIN, be translated: "And a priest shall be on his throne." But the suffix in *kiṣ'ō* is usually referred to *kohēn*. In that case the objections against this translation are fully justified. It is *not characteristic* of the priest that he should sit upon a throne, rather that he should stand before Jehovah (Deut. 17. 12, Judg. 20. 28),—an argument that is, of course, not weakened by a reference to 1 Sam. 4. 13. 18. And the announcement that in the Messianic time there should also be a priest, would be almost inept. Precisely as in the preceding *'al-kiṣ'ō* the suffix is to be referred to the Messias (cp. Ex. 11. 5, 12. 29, where the suffix is probably best referred to *Par'oh*, and the at least analogous cases Jer. 13. 13, 22. 4), and the sense is: A priest shall sit beside the Messias on his (the Messias') throne (cp. on the implied situation, Ps. 110. 1, Rev. 3. 21, and the art. "Thron" in my *Bibelwörterbuch*, p. 1660*b*). The sense is rightly given in the LXX.: *kaì éstai hiereùs ek dexiòn autoû* (and a priest shall be on his right hand) (in accordance with which STADE, *Zeitsch. für die alttest. Wissensch.* 1881, p. 10, note, too hastily wishes to substitute *on his right hand* for *on his throne*, in the Hebrew text).—We may refer, further, to the fact that the juxtaposition of a Messianic king and a Messianic priest agrees with the vision of Zech. 4, where the kingship and the high priesthood (the two olive trees), or, otherwise, their bearers (the two branches of the olive, cp. ver. 14), are the organs which conduct to the organism of the theocracy the Spirit of Jehovah (the oil) by which it is nourished and preserved. The violent emendations of EWALD, HITZIG, and others in vv. 11 and 12 we consider superfluous. My conception of the passage is supported by H. SCHULTZ in *loc. cit.* p. 257 (2nd ed. pp. 744 f.).

tion is paid to the priesthood, sacrifice, the tithes, etc.; and the main purpose alleged for the judicial coming of Jehovah is the purifying and renewal of the Levites, in consequence of which the offerings of the purged community, offered through a purged priesthood, will be acceptable to Jehovah.[1]

There is yet another Messianic expectation, appearing first in the time of the Exile, and taking shape only after the Exile—the expectation, viz., that the Theocracy of the perfect time would be erected by *Jehovah's personal advent, and His celebration in the temple, constituted now His eternal dwelling-place, of His entrance into His own.*[2] That such a prophecy was developed at the date indicated has its reason in the fact that at that time the national and theocratic interest was mainly directed to the scheme of rebuilding the temple, and making it what it had been in former times. Even EZEKIEL had prophesied of the coming again of the glory of Jehovah into the new temple.[3] The "Great Unknown" had announced the near advent of the God of Israel.[4] But HAGGAI and ZECHARIAH were the first to give the building and glorifying of the temple such a central position among the prospects of salvation as to set even the conversion of the heathen in teleological relation to that event,[5] and to make the building of the temple the principal business of the Messias,[6] seeing that, with the dawn

[1] Mal. 3. 3 f.
[2] See Appendix A, Note VII.
[3] Ezek. 43. 2 ff.
[4] Isa. 40. 9 f., 52. 8, 60. 1 f. 19 f.
[5] Hag. 2. 7 ff., Zech. 6. 15.
[6] Zech. 6. 13, also 3. 9, 4. 7. 10.

of the perfect time, Jehovah will arise from His holy dwelling-place to make His abode for ever in the midst of Jerusalem.[1] With MALACHI, however, this coming to His temple of Jehovah, or the angel of the covenant, in whom He appears, and through whom, as the guardian and restorer of the covenant (hence the name), He holds the assize that separates evil-doers from His people, and takes to Himself His true people, becomes the main idea of Messianic prophecy.[2]

These references ought to suffice to convince us that, according to the counsel of God, the course of history and the change of historical circumstances necessarily

[1] Zech. 2. 10. 11. 13, 8. 3.

[2] Mal. 3. 1–9. 16 ff. The *mal'akh habberith* (angel of the covenant) is not identical with the previously mentioned messenger who goes before Jehovah, and is therefore not Elias (*contra* Ewald and Hitzig), for this view is contradicted by the mutual relations of the clauses of the verse, and particularly by the perfect parallelism of the two relative clauses, and their symmetrical reference to Mal. 2. 17. From both it is clear that the appearance of the angel of the covenant is simultaneous with the coming of the Lord to His temple, while the messenger of Jehovah (Elias) precedes both. Moreover, the *nir'āh* (appearing) of Mal. 3. 2 is not an appropriate phrase to apply to a merely human agent, and the judicial activity assigned to the angel of the covenant does not suit Elias. But neither also may we, with Hengstenberg, think of the Messias, or, with Hofmann, of another Moses. Rather is meant the angel of Jehovah, in whom Jehovah Himself appears, for He suffers His name (*i.e.* His manifested being) to dwell in him (cp. Ex. 23. 20, 14. 19, Num. 20. 16, Isa. 63. 9). This angel is also, in an essentially similar way, described as the angel of the covenant (Ex. 23. 20 ff). Since the foregoing remarks were published, and, as it would appear, independently of them, the correct view has been acknowledged by KÖHLER, PRESSEL, KEIL, KÜPER (in *loc. cit.* p. 436), and VON ORELLI (in *loc. cit.* p. 509). The objections of STEINER (4th ed. of HITZIG'S *Kleinen Propheten*) are irrelevant, for the copula before *mal'akh* does not prove his difference from *ha'ādhōn* (the Lord) (cp. Zech. 9. 9); the participle *bā'* after *hinnēh* has equal force with the Fut. Imperf. *yābho'*, and ver. 3 does not speak of a way-preparing, but of a sifting and purifying judicial function.

served gradually to develop the various germs of Messianic truth contained in the Old Testament religion, so as to indicate *from various points of view* the salvation which should appear when the time was fulfilled.[1]

2. It remains now to expound the *second* point, in which the influence of contemporary history makes itself from time to time felt even in the ideal substance of the Messianic prophecies. The history of the Old Testament covenant-people is itself the progressive carrying out of the plan devised by God for reaching the goal of His saving purposes. By God's leading and government Israel must be educated and prepared for the fulfilment of his calling and the reception of salvation. And the whole world-government of God, even in so far as it determines the fortunes of other peoples, has its centre and goal in the fulfilment of His decree regarding Israel. In the different periods of the history now one and now another of the fundamental laws of God's government of the world and His Kingdom comes prominently into view, just as Israel's ethico-religious condition, his external position, and the general circumstances of the nations may at this time or that determine. The moral order of the world, that presides over history and prescribes its course, asserts itself in relation to the different directions and objects pur-

[1] It is to the credit of HOFMANN that in his work, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, he has been the first to exhibit this connexion between history and prophecy from the point of view of a believer in revelation. This, in spite of the many deficiencies—due mainly to his disowning, on principle, all criticism—of this work in other respects.

sued by human freedom in such a way that now one and now another of the eternal truths which it embraces finds actual attestation in preference to others. The course of history is mainly determined, now by this anon by that other of the eternal thoughts of God, whose sum constitutes the unalterable programme of government which the King of kings has marked out for Himself. — At new turning-points, moreover, in the progress of historical development there generally emerge also to light, from the darkness of the hidden counsel of God, new moments of this saving plan. If history itself is the progressive carrying out of the Divine programme, it must also tend more and more to discover it. — Now, the prophet discerns the Divine teleology of the history of his time; to his enlightened eye there is granted an insight into the reason and purposes of the Divine action in the present and immediate future. Those thoughts of God, which take shape in the history of his time, as well as the new moments of the Divine purpose, which begin to be accomplished in it, emerge to his view from the dark confusion of daily events with a clearness that dispels the darkness. To give heed to the signs of the times, and point them out to others, to be to his contemporaries the interpreter of God's language to His people in the facts of history,—is, in fact, a part of the prophet's task that is essential to his vocation.—In view of the psychologically mediated origin of Messianic prophecy, we cannot but conclude that *the thoughts of God, which*

mainly determine the course of history in the time of the prophet, and with which, therefore, his mind is especially occupied, *are also the fundamental thoughts which give his Messianic prophecy its peculiar content and character.* For the same reason fresh combinations of historical circumstances, new "signs of the time," will yield fresh ideas for Messianic prophecy. *So often as, in the progress of history, preparations begin to be made towards a new issue, there will flash upon the prophet new gleams of insight into the saving purpose of God, and into the ways and means of its execution.* Hence the parallelism already mentioned between history and prophecy, hence the march together in step of the development of the history of the theocracy and the development of Messianic prophecy.

We shall attest and illustrate the truth of these remarks, as before, by some examples. One, lying immediately to hand, is the prophecy of *the entrance of the heathen into the Kingdom of God.* The universalistic tendency, inherent in the Old Testament religion, was, in the early days of the latter, restrained by the wholly national constitution of the theocracy, and the relation of sharp contrast in which at first Israel necessarily stood to other nations. As yet Israel altogether resembled an arrow hid in the quiver for future use (Isa. 49. 2). Even the Messianic prophecy of the oldest prophets is essentially particularistic. With JOEL the scene of the Kingdom, perfected on earth, is still the small country of Judah; there is not a single reference to the kingdom of the Ten Tribes; there

is not the slightest word of any participation by the heathen in the Messianic salvation. They are noticed only in so far as they stand in hostile opposition to the theocracy, and are therefore victims of the avenging judgment. But even this judgment strikes only the neighbouring peoples, including Egypt; the distant "men of Sheba" it leaves untouched.[1] With AMOS the Theocracy of the perfect time extends not only over the whole of Palestine, but also over the neighbouring countries, in so far as they had once been subjected by David.[2] But with Amos also, Judah with the house of David at its head is the recipient of the Messianic salvation; through their connexion with Judah, the Ephraimites also participate; *not so* on the other hand, the neighbouring heathen peoples, who can recognise only the *supremacy* of the people of God and of the house of David.—HOSEA also places the Messianic salvation within the prospect of Israel alone. In Zech. 9. 9 f. we meet, indeed, with an extension of the Messianic outlook beyond the confines of Israel; the *King of peace* exercises his blissful sway, over other peoples besides Israel, to the ends of the earth. But it is noticeable that it is only here that *for the first time* the universalistic moment, *contained in the idea of the theocratic kingship*, comes to view (p. 116). The *first* prophecy, preserved to us, properly relating to the entrance of the Gentiles into the

[1] Joel 3. 8.

[2] Hence Edom is not, as with JOEL, made a desert, but only subject to the people of God.

Kingdom, lies before us in those famous words, delivered by ISAIAH and MICAH, which show us the mountain of the house of Jehovah, towering above all other mountains, as the centre of the earth, whither all peoples go up, yearning for salvation, to be instructed in His ways by the God of Jacob, and to walk in His paths.[1] At the basis of this prophecy there lies the clear perception that in the counsel of God His revelation among His people Israel is destined for all humanity.—It is some older prophet, unknown to us,[2] who has been the first, in such words, to claim the whole earth for the Kingdom of his God, and to announce to all peoples the message of salvation. But he can hardly belong to a much earlier time. For precisely the circumstance that the two principal prophets of the Assyrian period, Isaiah and Micah, reproduce his words, proves how new and remarkable such a prophecy still appeared in their time, and the older prophetic writings, which are preserved to us, contain, as we have seen, no parallel to it.—But, apart from this passage, we find that Isaiah and Micah repeatedly express the universalistic idea. In Isa. 19. 18–25, in particular, it is developed in detail in a very peculiar manner. For here the prophet expressly shows us the theocracy of the last time as one embracing all the then known world, a universal Theocracy blessed by Jehovah in all its three parts. Israel, the inheritance—as it were, the original

[1] Isa. 2. 2–4, Micah 4. 1–4.

[2] In no case JOEL, as some have thought.

land (*Stammland*)—of Jehovah, making the centre, on the one side Egypt as a land and people that now belong to God, on the other Assyria, now also, as Israel, the work of His hands, neither of them any longer in conflict for the world supremacy, but both serving Jehovah, and enjoying peaceful mutual intercourse.—The case stands obviously thus: So long as Israel did no more than come in contact with neighbouring peoples, so long, *i.e.*, as the decree of God that the theocracy founded in Israel should have no merely national, but a universal-human destination, had *not as yet* declared itself *in history;* just so long Messianic prophecy *announces nothing* of the future extension of the theocracy over all peoples. *Only when,* through the successful efforts of the Assyrians to found a world-empire, *the fortunes of Israel* and the theocracy *began to entwine themselves with the fortunes of all peoples of the world known to Israel,* did this Divine catholicity of aim become apparent in the course of history to the enlightened eye of him who understood the signs of the times. Thenceforward Israel occupies, as it were, a loftier position—world-historical, and within the horizon of all peoples far and near. Hence the clear full knowledge, beginning from this time, that God's deeds in and for Israel concern all peoples;[1] hence it is that an Isaiah begins to draw the entire history of the world within the sphere of prophecy by first concerning himself in detail with the fortunes of foreign peoples; hence also, in short, *the idea in*

[1] Cp. *e.g.* Isa. 8. 9, 18. 3. 7, 33. 13.

Messianic prophecy of the universality of the perfected Kingdom of God. May we not, perhaps, go further? May we not say that just as Assyria, the instrument in the hand of Jehovah, was impelled to intervene in the history of Israel, and so minister unconsciously to the fulfilment of God's purpose, she must needs similarly have exercised—and that altogether immediately—a stimulating effect upon the development of the knowledge of God's saving purpose. For the idea of a world-empire, a universal monarchy was grasped by the Assyrians earlier than by the Israelites. In the claim laid by the Assyrian kings to a world-supremacy, which, according to their high-flown insolence[1] no people *and no god* would keep from them or diminish, the prophets found occasion to extract its legitimate consequence from the Old Testament idea of God—viz. that this supremacy must belong much rather to the king of Israel. The very fact that there stood opposed to the theocracy this universal monarchy of Assyria, in part already founded, in part only in prospect, elicits the conception and prospect of a universal Theocracy, taking the place of all other kingdoms, and gathering all peoples into its unifying embrace.

Henceforward the universalistic idea remained a moment of significant prominence in Messianic prophecy; it is so with ZEPHANIAH,[2] with HABAKKUK,[3] with the author of Zech. 12–14,[4] with JEREMIAH.[5] With

[1] Isa. 10. 13 f., 36. 18 ff., 37. 11 ff.
[2] Esp. Zeph. 2. 11, 3. 9.
[3] Hab. 2. 14.
[4] Zech. 14. 9. 16.
[5] Jer. 3. 17, 4. 2, 12. 15 ff., 16. 19 f., 46. 26, 48. 47, 49. 6. 39.

Ezekiel, on the other hand, while the universalistic idea is not altogether absent, there is a return of the old particularism—a circumstance that harmonises with his Levitico-priestly standpoint, already discussed.—The most significant advance in the development of prophecy is, however, marked by the oracles—of the time of the Exile—of the interest of the heathen in the Messianic salvation. In the Book Isa. 40–66 this prophecy unfolds the richest and fairest blossoms. When Israel was actually scattered among the nations, and godly Israelites had in their close and constant contact with the heathen a perpetual witness to the vanity and contemptible folly of idolatry, and were made thus only the more conscious of the rich treasure entrusted to them in the revelation of the only true and living God, and of the victorious force of the truth, not only did the certainty, that at no distant date all the peoples would acknowledge Jehovah, and the theocracy be extended over the whole earth, mount to the highest pitch of confidence; but there was awakened and developed the consciousness, that Israel had been elected by God *just for this purpose*, that he might be a light to the heathen by bringing to all peoples the knowledge of the true God.[1] Thus, here also the new historical circumstances yield a new idea to Messianic prophecy, whose rich content has, of course, been unfolded by none other as by the Great Unknown; for his successors, the post-Exilian prophets,

[1] Cp. my art. "Der Missionsgedanke im Alten Testament" in Dr. Warneck's *Allg. Missions-Zeitschrift*, 1880, pp. 462 ff.

while they take up the promise of the future conversion of the heathen, do not develop, as he did, its broad and deep significance.

A few further references may, in conclusion, be adduced in proof of the positions just laid down. Characteristic of the prophets of the Assyrian period, Isaiah and Micah, is the oft-repeated thought that only a *remnant* will turn to Jehovah and participate in the Messianic salvation. This fundamental thought of their Messianic prophecy is at the same time one of the thoughts of God that are prominent in the history of that period. By the destruction of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes the people of God were first of all reduced to the citizens of the kingdom of Judah, and after the judgment passed upon this kingdom and executed by the Assyrians, there was left spared but a remnant—Jerusalem and those who had fled thither.[1] —In the Assyrian period, moreover, there comes into clearest light the truth *that not even the greatest world-power can destroy the little kingdom of God*, or frustrate God's saving purpose concerning Israel, and that, indeed, the power that makes the attempt only promotes thereby its own ruin. *That the right hand of the Lord maintains the victory* over all enemies, was preached at that time with special impressiveness by the history both of the Syro-Ephraimitic war and the hostile expedition of Sennacherib. Hence this truth also forms a dominant note in the Messianic prophecy of Isaiah, to whose spiritual vision the impending victory of

[1] Isa. 37. 4. 32.

Jehovah over the Assyrian world-power appears almost with the clearness of the actual event. *The victorious power of Jehovah* and His anointed is a feature of his pictures of the perfect time that is everywhere prominent. It destroys all external enemies and hardened evil-doers, and thus makes possible the erection of the perfected Kingdom.—The close connexion between prophecy and history shows itself, *again*, with special clearness in the fact that *the* Messianic prophecy, which promises the conclusion of an entirely new covenant between Jehovah and His people, and distinctly and definitely characterises the *Theocracy of the last days as one different from the theocracy that had existed hitherto*,[1] is announced by *just the* prophet who could not have failed to become convinced, beyond all his predecessors, of the inefficiency of the Old Testament institutions, and who watched the approach of the inevitable *destruction* of the existing theocracy. Jeremiah's experience led him to the perception that not even the reformation of the good king Josiah had been able to prevent the degeneracy of the whole people that followed upon his death. It had become fully apparent that a law that was external to the people could not keep them permanently true to their God. The kingship (since the death of Josiah) and the priesthood had tended rather to the complete derangement than to the preservation of the theocracy. And even genuine prophecy, handicapped by a conflict with a gang of false prophets, was not in a position to prevent

[1] Jer. 31. 29–34; cf. 3. 16 f.

the corruption, although it undoubtedly contained the force that would in the future renovate the people. It is at this moment that there flashes across the prophet, who sees the downfall of the existing theocracy approaching, the insight that *the renewed Theocracy*, which is to have an eternal continuance, *must be different in kind* from that which has hitherto existed. *The Divine judgments, he is compelled to announce, themselves teach him a lesson in the truth that, as regards the substantial form of the theocracy, all old things must pass away and all things become new. Further:* During the Exile the Theocracy, destroyed as to its outward existence, and destitute of any external help or support, was preserved *solely* by the living faith and stedfast *faithfulness*, maintained even in extreme *sufferings*, of those who were the bearers and representatives of the idea of the Servant of Jehovah—*i.e.* the ideal corporate personality of the ministry[1] chosen and employed by Jehovah for the carrying out of His saving purpose. In correspondence with this is the announcement of prophecy (Isa. 40–66), that it is only *by these means* that the Kingdom can be accomplished. As in the actual history the victorious power of Jehovah and His

[1] This "ministry" is, in the first instance, Israel as the people of Jehovah's possession; but later it appears before the general community and over against it as the true people of God, consisting of His actual "servants." In view of the catholic task entrusted to them, and implied in their election, the people of Israel are the servant of Jehovah "according to the flesh;" the true worshippers of Jehovah, taken separately, in so far as they, like the prophets, are taken by God into His special service, are the servant of Jehovah "according to the spirit." The mutual relation of the visible and the invisible Church forms a perfect parallel.

human organs was not externally prominent, but it was clear rather that, according to the Divine counsel, the final victory must be won by a constant faithfulness to God, and a fulfilment even, if need were, in the midst of suffering, and in *apparent external defeat* of the life-task imposed by Him; so in Messianic prophecy the idea comes to be emphasised that faithfulness even unto death and deepest humiliation in suffering are, for the servant of God, the way to glory. *Finally:* In the nature of the case it was precisely the true worshippers of Jehovah who had mainly to endure the sufferings of the Exile; *they* it was who had to suffer most from the heathen masters, and who were besides hated and persecuted by their apostate fellow-countrymen. These godly persons, in whom the idea of the servant of God had attained the greatest realisation, were not, of course, guiltless; they confessed in the name of the people and in their own name that the misery of the Exile was the righteous punishment of their sins.[1] Still they kept hold of their God in faith and loyalty; so far as they were the bearers of the idea of the servant of God they had not deserved the Exile; and all that they had to suffer, *because of their faithfulness in the service of Jehovah,* was a sinless suffering. *They* bore above others the effects of the guilt of Israel's denial of his calling—his rejection of his ideal. It was laid upon them to bear the heaviest part of the burden of the judgment upon Israel's faithlessness. Upon this true people of God in the midst of

[1] Isa. 64. 4 ff.

Israel, the (relatively) righteous representatives of the unrighteous and faithless Israel, God's wrath against the unfaithfulness of His people was executed. Their suffering was *a substitutionary bearing of Israel's corporate guilt.* It was a guilt-offering for the defections of their people. And just for these His servants' sake,[1] just because of their enduring faithfulness and patience shown in this suffering, the faithful covenant-God could not for ever leave His people in the power of their enemies. In consideration of the willing patience with which they endured the execution of His wrath against the sins of the mass of the people, it behoved Him for their sake to be gracious to the nation of Israel as a whole. Their substitutionary suffering, therefore, presented itself as a chastisement which should bring about the salvation of the entire people. Thus the historical circumstances of the period of the Exile disclose yet another view of the saving purpose of God. There is developed the perception that Israel and humanity *owe the salvation* of the perfect time *to the substitutionary punitive suffering which the innocent servant of God endures in the faithful discharge of his prophetic vocation for the sins of others, and which is for himself the God-ordained path to glory.*[2]

We see thus how of necessity history always co-öperated with Messianic prophecy, enabling it to bring to light one moment after another of God's saving purpose, and to give ever clearer and more definite deliverances as to the end of the ways of God.

[1] Isa. 65. 8. [2] Isa. 53.

So much regarding the qualifying and determining influence of the varying times upon the content of Messianic prophecy. We are now sufficiently prepared to determine with some accuracy in a third and last section the relation of Messianic prophecy to *New Testament fulfilment.*

THIRD PART.

THE RELATION OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY TO NEW TESTAMENT FULFILMENT.

THE tendency of our argument hitherto has been to expose the error of regarding Messianic prophecy as consisting of so many isolated products of a creative spirit of revelation, which, working with wholly immediate effect, and refusing to bind itself to any law of human or historical development, finds a constant pleasure in the altogether supernatural production of absolutely new truths. The religion of the Old Testament covenant-people — a religion founded and developed by the self-revelation of God—is the mother-soil on which prophecy has grown, and from which it has drawn its nourishment. We recognised in prophecy the new blossoms and fruits which, under the continuous revealing and enlightening activity of the Spirit of God, have developed themselves from germs which the Old Testament religion from the first kept hid within itself. In these blossoms and fruits, appearing in course of time, we remarked a rich variety of form and colour, the reason of which we saw to be —apart from the mental peculiarities of the several prophets—chiefly the qualifying and determining influ-

ence which historical conditions and circumstances exercise in every period upon Messianic prophecy. As the prophet in all cases regards his historical present in the light thrown back upon it from the end of the ways of God, so, conversely, he sees the brilliance of the final salvation only in the scattered and coloured rays through which alone the atmosphere of his present suffers it to appear. Similarly, it depends upon the historical conditions and circumstances of any particular time which of the ideas contained in the Old Testament religion, and incorporated in the Old Testament theocracy, is made the starting-point of Messianic prophecy, or which aspect of the final salvation is made specially prominent through the unfolding of the germs of Messianic truth which it contains. And, finally, the thoughts of God which, as fundamental principles of the government of the world, or as moments of God's sovereign plan, principally determine the course of history in the time of the prophet, are also the fundamental thoughts which give to Messianic prophecy its peculiar character and content; and thus, in the course of the history of the Old Covenant, whensoever anything new is about to transpire, there flash across the minds of the prophets new apprehensions regarding the saving purpose of God, and the ways and means in which it is destined to attain accomplishment.

Before we attempt, on the basis of these results, to determine with precision the relation of Messianic prophecy to New Testament fulfilment, let us remind

ourselves once more of the clear distinction between the *content* of prophecy—the sense, *i.e.*, in which the prophets themselves understood their own utterances, and wished them to be understood by their contemporaries, and that *ultimate reference* to *fulfilment through Christ* which is ordained in God's decree, and which entitles them to a place in the process of historical revelation. Into the former there must be conveyed none of the significance which the word of prophecy has acquired only for us who look back upon the entire course of the development of Messianic prophecy in the light of New Testament fulfilment (pp. 6 ff.). On the basis of this clean-cut separation of Old Testament prophecy from New Testament fulfilment, we have now to exhibit at once the *difference* and the *harmony* subsisting between the two.

1. That Old Testament prophecy and New Testament fulfilment are not entirely coextensive terms, that, on the contrary, the latter transcends the limit of the former, is not denied even from the standpoint of the one-sided supranaturalistic method of Scripture study, although the inclination to reduce the difference to the lowest measure possible by reading the soteriology of the New Testament into the prophecies of the Old, accords exactly with the essence of this method, and always makes itself felt more or less in its exegesis. Still this standpoint always insists upon *this* at least: that prophecy should be completely covered by the fulfilment. The particular Messianic announcements, it is argued, all indeed bear in themselves the mark

of one-sidedness, because in every case there is shown to the vision of the prophet only the truth which is adapted to and capable of affecting the crisis of the particular time, and his prophecy is invariably but the correct expression of what he has seen. The Messianic prophecies are therefore, it is urged, fragments; but these fragments must admit of being pieced together in a uniform well-fitted mosaic, so as to form an essentially complete picture of the Messianic salvation and the manner of its accomplishment. The task of construction is, moreover, very considerably lightened by the fact that the record of the fulfilment supplies us with the clue that enables us to determine with certainty the place of each separate piece. There may be vacant spaces here and there in the prophetic picture; it may not be altogether sufficient to represent the entire fulness and glory of the New Testament salvation. But there *cannot be any feature in the prophecies to which there is not some corresponding feature in the fulfilment.* To suppose otherwise is to suppose that the prophets did not really speak God's word, did *not* describe *only* what God's Spirit granted them to see of the future salvation. This is in the main HENGSTENBERG'S view of the relation of prophecy to fulfilment, and it leads inevitably to that spiritualistic evaporising of the concrete, historical, and specifically Old Testament features in the Messianic prophecies of whose illegitimacy we have already led satisfactory proof[1] (pp. 150 ff.). On the basis of

[1] Cp. HENGSTENBERG'S *Christologie*, iii. 2, pp. 185 ff.

our preceding argument we must declare this view untenable, and the attempt to piece together in one complete picture, without qualification, all the individual features of Messianic prophecy, and to find in Christ and His Kingdom the fulfilment of every individual feature, we must pronounce at once unwarrantable and impracticable. Understood in their true historic sense, the individual Messianic prophecies are the various forms in which in the course of its development, and under varying historical circumstances, the Messianic idea asserted itself. They ought not to be compared to the fragments of a picture—a figure that could originate only at the lifeless, external, mechanical point of view of a one-sided supernaturalism. They should be compared rather to the different forms of a living organism, which advances through a series of phases of development. Just as, in the course of its development, individual leaves fall from a plant, and are replaced by new ones; as in the development of the brute-organism every organ assumes just the form in which at that particular stage of development it can best fulfil its intended purpose,—so it is with Messianic prophecy. Its concrete significance, its special bearing on the historical circumstances of the time of its origin, is of so great importance at the time of its announcement that, apart from it, it would be able only very imperfectly, if at all, to fulfil its destination. But this importance is transitory; it is limited to the time during which the circumstances in question continue, and attaches

to the times-borrowed features of the prophecy for only so long as the historical stage of development, to which the prophecy belongs, lasts. By the time the historical circumstances were substantially altered, those elements of the prophecy had, at least in part and as a rule, found their relative times-adapted fulfilment, and so far as this was not the case they could never afterwards be fulfilled in the sense which they had for the prophet and his contemporaries. Such a fulfilment would have been possible only on the supposition that the Messianic salvation had been really intended in the counsel of God to appear so soon as the prophets anticipated, *i.e.* actually in the time during which the historical circumstances of the time in which the prophecy originated, continued for the main part unaltered. A later time lacked the conditions of a fulfilment corresponding to their historical sense. Hence, so soon as the historical circumstances have become substantially altered, Messianic prophecy drops these concrete features, — whether they have been relatively fulfilled or not,—and something altogether new takes the place of the old that has been outlived, and has lost its full significance and effective force. *Thus* a very considerable portion—as regards bulk—of the content of the Messianic prophecies *remains outside the sphere of New Testament fulfilment,* either through its having already found its relative times-adapted fulfilment before the "fulness of time," or through its remaining altogether unfulfilled.

But does not the admission that a portion of

prophecy remains thus unfulfilled necessarily present itself in a somewhat serious light? Announcements which are not confirmed by fulfilment seem in general hardly entitled to be ranked with truth that rests on revelation, but rather to be mere human thoughts and words that have originated in the prophet's own spirit,[1] and have commingled with what really proceeds from Divine revelation. The fulfilment of prophecies depends, of course, as a rule upon further conditions, expressed or tacitly assumed, which belong to the sphere of human freedom, and hence many a prophecy, though announced in the Spirit of God, may remain unfulfilled.[2] But it can never be explained in this way alone, how a portion of the content of prophecy should remain thus unfulfilled. No one can seriously pretend that if Israel had only exhibited a perfect faithfulness to his God it would have been possible, in every instance, for the Messianic salvation to appear so soon as, and precisely in the manner in which, the prophets announced; and yet only thus could all the times-borrowed elements of Messianic prophecy have

[1] *Millibbam* (cp. *sup.* pp. 16 ff.).

[2] Cp. on this BERTHEAU in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* iv. 334–353, who, however, goes too far in supposing that every case of the non-fulfilment of prophecy can be explained in this way, and whose argument seems in some places almost to assume that there was nothing unconditioned or unalterably stable in the purpose of God, and in particular that the time of the fulfilment of the promise was not predetermined in His eternal counsel; it appears, however, from his later expositions (*e.g.* pp. 655 f.) that this is not really his meaning. The remarks of H. SCHULTZ (in *loc. cit.* ii. pp. 57 ff., 2nd ed. pp. 242 ff.), both on the conditionedness of prophecy and on the limits of this conditionedness and alterableness, are much to the point.

been fulfilled. Its partial non-fulfilment has therefore an additional reason in a region above that in which the promise is conditioned by the conduct of men—that, viz., of the eternal counsel of God. Because the salvation was designed to appear only when the time was fulfilled, it was possible that the content of prophecy should be partially unfulfilled. But in that case do not the scruples we feel at the suggestion of a non-fulfilment of prophecy seem justified? Do not the announcements which fail to harmonise with the purpose that God has actually conceived and carried out appear only as a disturbing element, which in consequence of the limits[1] imposed upon his prospect, the prophet has mixed up with the announcement of what the Spirit had revealed to him of the counsel of God?

Such, indeed, would necessarily be our verdict if to the concrete historical features of the Messianic prophecies there belonged only the sense that is *limited* to the *time of their origin*. Over and above this sense, however, they have a *permanent significance*, relating them to the New Covenant, and finding in the latter its realisation.

For they embody, after all, moments of the Messianic idea itself, which is through them concretely applied to the circumstances of a definite time. What is passing encloses thus necessarily also something that is permanent; in the husk of the historical present there is an ideal kernel of the eternal thoughts of God,

[1] Cp. pp. 139 ff. 146 ff. 122 ff.

and when in the later development of Messianic prophecy the husk is stripped off, the kernel is not therefore surrendered; it reappears as a constituent of later prophecy, but, of course, metamorphosed and invested with a new form adapted to its altered circumstances, which latter also, when its term has expired, gives place to some other times-adapted investiture. A sifting process is thus accomplished, in the course of the development of Messianic prophecy, upon the contents of the individual prophecies, the result of which is to show what portion of them is of substantial and permanent import as revealing the Divine purpose *regarding the final salvation*, and what, on the contrary, has only an accidental and passing significance as being merely the envelope in which the relative moments of this purpose had to be conveyed to the consciousness and lively perception of the prophet and his contemporaries. The former portion is the substance-proper of the revelation that is intended for all times. The latter, on the other hand, is either only the announcement of such moments of the Divine purpose as relate to individual stations of *the way to* the goal of the final salvation, or, at best, only some *temporary means or channel of revelation;* hence its partial non-fulfilment need be no occasion of stumbling, nor does it in the least degree mark it as a disturbing element, mixed up with the genuine oracles of revelation by the prophet himself without the connivance of the Spirit.

As regards their essential and permanent substance,

individual prophecies actually stand in a *complementary relation* to one another. For the historical circumstances of any particular time have always, in greater or less degree, their peculiar stamp—they have always, so to speak, their specialties, which never exactly repeat themselves in any later time. Hence in the times-features of the individual prophecies there are always represented some moments or other of the Divine purpose of salvation which no longer appear in the later prophecies, or, at the least, some aspect of these moments is illumined which the historical circumstances of later times do not offer any opportunity of again bringing to light. Thus, in the application necessarily made of it in course of time to a great variety of different historical circumstances, the Messianic idea unfolds the wealth of its content, and every individual prophecy contributes its part to the work of bringing this content completely into view.

As regards, further, their ideal and permanent substance, even the times-features of the Messianic prophecies are referable to *Christ and His kingdom;* and, indeed, it is only in so far as they relate to Him that the oft-repeated saying of Christ is applicable to them: "*deî plērōthénai pánta tà gegramména perì emoû.*"[1] The eternal thoughts of God that form their kernel, attained necessarily in the New Covenant a full accomplishment in Christ, and through Him, consequently, they find the fulfilment best suited to their deepest,

[1] "It is necessary that all things written concerning me should be ulfilled."

their ideal substance, whereas the times-fulfilment,—if in the history of the Old Covenant there have been such,—while it corresponds, indeed, more precisely with the literal and historical sense of the words, *i.e.* with the concrete form which the eternal thoughts of God, in their application to definite historical circumstances, have received in these prophecies, presents itself, nevertheless, only as an imperfect and temporary accomplishment of the kernel-thoughts. It is clear from this that, just in consequence of the times-colouring of all Messianic prophecies, the typico-Messianic element forms a considerable portion of their content, and thus the assertion that *a typico-Messianic character is more or less peculiar to them all,* is well founded.

These remarks seem to us a sufficient acknowledgment of the measure of truth contained in the view of Hengstenberg criticised above, and in particular in his spiritualising exegesis of the prophecies. It is true that when our object is to exhibit *that ultimate reference of the Messianic prophecies to the fulfilment in Christ which gives them their place in the process of historical revelation,* only the idea contained in the times-borrowed features is of essential importance, inaccurate as it is to speak of the times-form, in which the idea is expressed, as if it were a mere figure. Hengstenberg's mistake, momentous as of course it is, consists, in fact, solely in his failure to distinguish sufficiently between the content proper of the prophecies and that God-intended and God-ordained reference to their ultimate fulfilment which is recog-

nisable only in the later progress of the history of revelation and salvation, and in his misapprehension of the significance of their historical sense.[1]

2. Similar to the case of the times-borrowed elements of Messianic prophecy is that of *its specifically Old Testament features*. These grow from the soil of the Old Testament religion. The prophets' knowledge of the Divine thoughts of salvation, which are to take effect in the New Covenant, is, in harmony with the fact of its psychologically mediated origin, developed from Old Testament conceptions; they can therefore announce these thoughts only as they are apprehensible from the Old Testament standpoint. In particular, the prophet's conception of the perfected Kingdom can never wholly disentangle itself from his view of the existing theocracy; every prophet will to a certain extent conceive and present the completion of the Kingdom of God as merely the perfecting and the glorifying of the existing theocracy, and hence every prophecy will have to a certain extent a specifically Old Testament colouring, betraying the soil from which it has sprung.[2] Equally with the times-features these specifically Old Testament elements are for the prophetic consciousness no mere figures; they are rather the envisaging forms under which it possesses the knowledge of the saving thoughts. It is true that even the prophet himself has in many cases a more or less clear

[1] Cp. p. 152, note.

[2] Cp. Oehler, art. "Weissagung," in Herzog's *Realencykl.* xvii. 655, and *Theologie des Alten Testamentes*, ii. § 216.

consciousness of the fact that these envisaging forms are inadequate to express the saving thoughts which they invest; hence not unfrequently there appear, borrowed from the conception of the existing theocracy, features which the prophets could not conceivably mean to be understood literally, in their use of which they are manifestly concerned much rather with the idea than with the envisaging form, which latter, indeed, seems to pass completely over into the sphere of conscious symbolism. Think, for example, of the announcement that *all the heathen* who survive the judgment *will come year by year* to Jerusalem to celebrate the *Feast of Tabernacles*,[1] or that "all flesh" will make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem *every Sabbath and every new moon*.[2] Even in delineations of the perfected Kingdom that keep themselves in other respects within the limits of Old Testament conceptions, the same transition is sometimes observable in individual features, yet not to such an extent as to warrant the whole being taken allegorically. Thus, *e.g.*, Ezekiel, in the description of the new theocracy in the famous prophecy of the stream proceeding from the dwelling-place of God and transforming the holy land into paradise, allows the idea to emerge most unmistakably from its Old Testament investiture, and makes the latter appear only as its symbolic veil.—Nevertheless, as a rule, the prophet cannot consciously distinguish between the Old Testament envisaging form and the saving thoughts of God which it contains; he grasps the latter only in the

[1] Zech. 14. 16 ff. [2] Isa. 66. 23.

envelope of the former, and is, in general, not in a position to dispense with the Old Testament envelopes.[1] But what he is personally unable to accomplish, accomplishes itself, for the most part, in the course of the total development of Old Testament prophecy, for at its culminating points the apprehension of the saving thoughts of God tends clearly to free itself from the limitations of Old Testament conceptions. And indeed, in general, the prophecy that is later in point of time is also the prophecy that is more developed and that brings to clearer and more perfect light the saving purpose of God and the true character of the perfected Kingdom. On the whole, the kernel of the eternal thoughts of God tends, in the Messianic prophecies of the later prophets, more and more to shine through and discard the Old Testament veils. While, *e.g.*, the oldest Messianic prophecy still preserves, even in the delineation of the perfected Kingdom, the national exclusiveness of the existing theocracy, this exclusiveness has already disappeared in the prophets of the Assyrian period, who represent the Kingdom as extending over the whole earth and embracing all peoples.[2] But especially in Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah Messianic prophecy reaches a pitch of development in which the far-reaching difference between the Old Testament economy and that of the New Covenant is clearly recognised and expressed.—Still, the validity

[1] Cp., on the above propositions, the pertinent remarks of THOLUCK in *Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*, pp. 149–156.

[2] Cp. pp. 205 ff.

of this canon is but a conditioned and limited validity; for, on the one hand, the degree in which the Messianic apprehensions remain envisaged in specifically Old Testament forms, depends to a considerable extent upon the standpoint of the particular prophet, as we see instanced in the case of Ezekiel, who, though the contemporary of Jeremiah, has, least of all, been able to figure to himself the people of God of the future time apart from the institutions and ordinances of the Old Testament theocracy;[1] and, on the other hand, in the course of historical development relapses constantly occur after the attainment of culminating points, as is exemplified in the fact that in the post-Exilian time the limitation of Messianic apprehension to Old Testament forms becomes again much greater than with Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah. These heights of development, however, at which Messianic prophecy, whether as a whole or in some of its individual utterances, approximates most closely to New Testament assurance, involuntarily reveal themselves clearly and definitely to the eye of one who lives in the time of fulfilment. From them as standpoints, the essential oneness of a whole of Messianic prophecy that yet has been developed through various historical stages is seen to lie ready for review. Through the light falling from them upon the lower stages, prophecy itself reveals the note of transiency which attaches to many of its Old Testament envelopes of the Divine thoughts of salvation. It shows that

[1] Cp. pp. 129 ff.

these envisaging forms, like the times-features, are not of the substance of revelation, but are merely temporary —sometimes even merely individual—means of revelation, which are able to claim a permanent significance only in virtue of their typico-symbolical character.

If, *e.g.*, according to Ezekiel, animal sacrifices, including even sin- and guilt-offerings, are still to be offered in the perfected Kingdom,[1] Hosea and Isaiah have already taught us to see in this something that belongs merely to the Old Testament envelopes of the prophetic word, the former, by his representation of the repentant people as vowing, not animal sacrifices, but the "calves of our lips,"[2] *i.e.* praise to God as thanksgiving for His mercies; the latter, by his omitting—Isa. 19. 21 apart —all mention either of sacrificial ritual or of priesthood in connexion with the people of God of the Messianic time.

If, according to Ezekiel, the difference between priests and laity is to continue even in the Messianic time, or be made even more rigid than formerly,[3] and the people to be instructed, as formerly, by the priests in the ceremonial law,[4] prophecies like that of Jeremiah, that in the New Covenant all will have the same access to God and the same knowledge of Him,[5] or that of Deutero-Isaiah, that all Israel will be a nation of priests, and will be taught in all his members by Jehovah Himself,[6] tend to place such utterances in the

[1] Ezek. 40. 39, 42. 13, 44. 29, 46. 20.
[2] Hos. 14. 2.
[3] Ezek. 44. 19.
[4] *Ib.* ver. 23.
[5] Jer. 31. 34.
[6] Isa. 61. 6, 66. 21, 54. 13.

light of an Old Testament element in the prophecy of Ezekiel, to which only an individual importance can be attached. And if Ezekiel describes with the utmost minuteness the new temple which is to be erected in Jerusalem, and in which God will dwell in the midst of His people; if, similarly, post-Exilian prophecy lays the greatest stress upon an adornment of the temple that will make it a worthy dwelling-place of God, because it also conceives the gracious presence of God among His people as associated even in the perfect time with the visible sanctuary,—we must put side by side with such utterances the announcement of Jeremiah, that in the Messianic kingdom there will no longer be an ark of the covenant or an inaccessible Holy of holies, for the entire holy city will be the throne of Jehovah, and all peoples will assemble thither as to the place where God reveals Himself,[1]—an announcement in the light of which the other conception must appear also as an Old Testament husk, which the more developed Messianic prophecy has already stripped off as but the vesture of the saving thoughts of God.

Thus by the criticism which Old Testament prophecy, considered as a whole, passes upon the details of its own content there are separated from each other, also as regards a great number of the specifically Old Testament features of prophecy, the transient envisaging forms, and the saving thoughts which they enclose; and it goes without saying that the former must lie outside the sphere of New Testament fulfilment, while

[1] Jer. . 16 f.

the latter attain accomplishment in the New Covenant. Hence the sphere of the typico-Messianic, the sphere, *i.e.*, of the prophecies which do not find fulfilment in Christ in their historic sense, but only in their ideal substance, embraces, as Old Testament prophecy itself teaches, a large portion of its peculiarly Old Testament theocratic conceptions.[1]

3. But can a separation between the Divine saving thoughts and their transient envisaging forms, which takes place thus during the actual historical development of revelation, be said to have been completed within the era of the Old Covenant,—say with the extinction of prophecy? Must we not from the first take for granted that in general the Divine saving thoughts have emerged into full light only through their realisation in actual fact, and that hence the complete discarding of the Old Testament husks, which invest them in Messianic prophecy, cannot have happened sooner? Such indeed is the fact. Even at its highest pitches of development Messianic prophecy could not rid itself *entirely* of specifically Old Testament conceptions. Some pervade the entire scheme of prophecy, and present themselves only in the light of New Testament fulfilment as merely symbolico-typical husks of ideas, whose accomplishment was

[1] Cp. Oehler, art. "Weissagung," p. 656: "It is not the consciousness of the individual prophet, but the Spirit of revelation Himself, who already within the Old Testament at each higher stage of prophecy strips off the temporary form adhering to the prophecy of the earlier stage, until in the fulfilment the full extent of the symbolic investiture comes to be recognised." Cp. *Theologie des Alten Testamentes*, ii. § 216.

decreed in God's saving purpose. Of this nature is the conception that *Jerusalem*, the city which Jehovah had chosen to place His name there, would also in the perfect time be the place of God's revealing and gracious presence on earth, and as such the centre of the Kingdom; there God will dwell in the midst of His people; thence also He exercises the sovereignty over His Kingdom, which embraces all lands; there also He becomes manifest to the heathen, and there all peoples worship Him. Even in the announcement that God's revealing presence will no longer be tied to the ark of the covenant or the inaccessible Holy of holies,[1] Jeremiah holds fast by this conception; it dominates similarly all the other Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, and betrays its influence, now in wider, now in narrower compass, in the concrete details of the delineated picture of the Messianic theocracy.

And certainly Jerusalem, as the place where the Mediator of the New Covenant offered His all-sufficient, eternally-availing sacrifice, where by His resurrection He showed Himself the Prince of life, where the Holy Spirit was poured out upon the disciples, became, even in the history of the fulfilment, the principal scene of the Divine revelations and deeds which have accomplished the final salvation; as such it remains in a certain sense, even for the New Testament Theocracy, a centre, whither turn all eyes that are directed to God's saving revelation in the Son. So far Jerusalem's

[1] Jer. 3. 16 f.

election came to its rights even in the New Testament fulfilment; so far also the conception of its centrality that pervades Old Testament prophecy is signally attested as conformable to the decree of God. But only so far; neither in Jerusalem nor in any other place on earth has the Kingdom of Christ, which is "not of this world," an external visible centre, as the theocracy of the Old Testament had; with Christ there dawned a time in which Jerusalem, as well as Mount Gerizim, loses its character of eminence as a holy place, —the time of a worship of God in spirit and truth,[1] freed from all limitation as to place, time, and external ceremony. The express testimony of Christ, and the actual character of His Kingdom permit us to recognise in the conception that Jerusalem should be permanently the place of Jehovah's revelation and worship, merely an Old Testament form of envisagement of which Messianic prophecy was unable to rid itself—an inability resulting from the fact that to the last it held to the conception of a theocracy *confined to the natural*[2] *terrestrial world*, whereof anon.—Hence the conception of Jerusalem as the "city of God" receives in the New Testament also a symbolico-typical significance. Even Jewish theology had distinguished the upper,[3] other-world, heavenly Jerusalem, from the lower[4] Jerusalem, which is but its earthly image; and Philo's speculative idealism had found in Jerusalem, the city of God, a figure of the world as the place

[1] John 4. 23 f.

[2] [*Diesseitig.*—Tr.]

[3] *Yerushālayim shĕl-ma'ălāh.*

[4] *Yerushālayim shĕl-maṭṭāh.*

of God's abode and revelation, or of the soul of the wise man, in whom God dwells.[1] In the same way the New Testament opposes to the earthly Jerusalem its antitype, the heavenly, expressing thus symbolically the contrast between the Old Testament theocracy (the earthly Jerusalem) and the Kingdom of Christ (the heavenly Jerusalem), which belongs essentially to the supersensuous heavenly world, and is the sphere of the substantial presence of God and of full communion with Him, and conceiving at the same time of the latter as already existing on earth in the Church, though its perfect form is meanwhile only in heaven, and descends thence to the earth only at the second coming of Christ.[2] This heavenly Jerusalem takes, in the New Covenant, the place of the earthly, which is only its shadow; hence also *the New Testament writers referred the Old Testament prophecies of the glorifying of Jerusalem* as the place of God's abode and revelation in the Messianic kingdom—with elimination of the peculiarly Old Testament elements—to this

[1] Cp. my *Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes*, pp. 253 f.

[2] And indeed the "New Jerusalem" of the Apocalypse (Rev. 3. 12, 21. 2 ff. 10 ff.), intimately allied to the phrase of the Jewish theology, is the Kingdom of Christ in *its other-world accomplishment*, in which it exists at present only in heaven, to lower itself thence to earth not sooner than the Parousia. In the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, on the other hand (Heb. 11. 10. 16, 12. 22, 13. 14), "the heavenly Jerusalem" denotes the Kingdom of Christ that is indeed complete only in heaven (so far therefore a future kingdom), and yet is already erected even in this world, affording to believers a means of intercourse with the supersensible heavenly world, and of enjoying its goods (cp. my *Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes*, pp. 117 ff.). The "Jerusalem which is above" of the Apostle Paul (Gal. 4. 26; cp. Phil. 3. 20) has essentially the same significance.

heavenly Jerusalem, in other words, *to the Kingdom of Christ*,[1] and found foretold in them its future erection in glorious accomplishment at the time of the Parousia. This is seen most clearly in those numerous passages of the Apocalypse where the features descriptive of the New Jerusalem are borrowed from the last chapters of Ezekiel and from Deutero-Isaiah.

Can the case be otherwise with another conception which also pervades all Old Testament prophecy—the conception, viz., that Israel, as Jehovah's chosen and peculiar people, will continue to be, even in the last time and with conservation of his national idiosyncracy, the kernel of the people of God, assuming, as a nation, a position of royalty in the Messianic kingdom, and fulfilling the priestly function of mediator between God and the rest of humanity? As is well known, a view, which was stoutly maintained by BENGEL and his school,—though its advocates in former centuries were but few and far between,—has found of late much acceptance in England and Germany, being represented, among others, by such considerable theologians as MICH. BAUMGARTEN, J. T. BECK, AUBERLEN, VON HOFMANN, DELITZSCH, and STIER, to the effect that when the "times of the Gentiles"[2] have expired, the prophecies, implied in such announcements, will find a literal fulfilment in Israel as a nation. Peculiar once and for ever, it is urged, to the people of Israel in virtue of their election, is the calling, which assigns them their place in the history of salvation, as the recipients and mediators

[1] Cp. *e.g.* the citation in Gal. 4. 27. [2] *Kairoì ethnôn.*

of Divine revelation, and constitutes them a royal, priestly people, whose part it is to mediate the relations of the rest of humanity to God. Granted that Israel was the recipient of the Divine revelations in the time of the Old Covenant, and that his calling and destination were fulfilled through Christ and His apostles, who indeed were a company of Israelites, this does not imply that the purposes of God in the election of Israel have been fully accomplished, or that the promises given to Israel, that he should in the future attain holiness *as a people*, and exercise his priestly vocation on behalf of all peoples, have been fulfilled. His vocation and his promises continue even in the time of the New Covenant, and that in spite of his obstinate refusal of God's revelation in His Son, and his consequent temporary rejection, for "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance,"[1] and these promises concern the last time, in which the Kingdom of God will assume its full glory. After the present period of the Kingdom of God, after the times of the Gentile Christian Church, when the kingdom of the Millennium shall have been erected, repentant Israel, gathered from the dispersion to the Holy Land, will appear at the head of humanity. Then will be heard again the voice of revelation, dumb since the time of Israel's rejection; then will the priestly kingdom of the people of Israel be upon earth what the glorified priest-kings are in heaven; then only does Israel as a people fulfil his destination, and participate in the glory

[1] Rom. 11. 29.

promised to him.[1] It is, further, only in the line of logical sequence that individual advocates of this view should expect not only the gathering of dispersed Israel into the land of Canaan, and the restoration of Jerusalem as the capital of the theocracy, but also the erection of the temple described by Ezekiel, and the revival of the ceremonial and civil law of Moses in the *cultus* and constitution of the Millennial kingdom.[2] This rendering of Old Testament prophecy has been contrasted favourably with the spiritualising typico-allegorical mode of exegesis that has prevailed in the Church, and passed as orthodox since the third century as marking a very substantial progress made in modern times in the understanding of the Divine prophetic word—a progress through which exegesis for the first time does justice to the "realism of Scripture" as well as to the true historical sense of the prophecies.—Such praise, however, we must take leave to a certain extent to call in question. The abandonment of the traditional spiritualising exegesis of the Church and the approximation to the strictly historical method of interpretation, must be allowed to mark real progress. When, however, the historical sense, gained by this

[1] Cp. *e.g.* AUBERLEN, *Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis*, 2nd ed. pp. 387 ff.; also his *Abhandlung über die messianischen Weissagungen der mosaischen Zeit in den Jahrbb. f. D. Theol.* 1858, Hft. iv. especially pp. 791, 801 ff., 834 ff., and HOFMANN'S *Schriftbeweis*, vol. ii. pt. 2, pp. 74 ff. (1st ed.).

[2] So, *e.g.*, J. J. HESS in his *Briefe über die Offenbarung Johannes*, pp. 130 ff.; but also AUBERLEN, *Der Prophet Daniel*, p. 401, and HOFMANN in *loc. cit.* p, 538, though his conception is less literal, and M. BAUMGARTEN in the article "Ezechiel" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie* (1st ed.) iv. pp. 303 f.

method, is, without distinction of the temporary or individual from the ideal or eternal elements, hastily assumed to be part of the substance of the prophecy, and is considered a literal announcement of the Divine decrees bearing on the final completion of the theocracy, I can see in this, not progress, but only retrogression—and *Judaistic error*.[1] It is an *exaggeration* of the importance of the historical sense due to *the same one-sided supernaturalism in the mode of viewing* prophecy noticeable in the unhistorical spiritualising method of the elder orthodoxy; hence also it shares with the latter the erroneous assumption that Old Testament prophecy must be completely covered by a New Testament fulfilment, in which the content of every individual feature will be fully represented. It is chargeable, moreover, with the same mistaken commingling of Old and New Testament elements, only with the difference that, whereas the old orthodoxy introduces New Testament perceptions into the Old Testament, this new supernaturalism takes over into the economy of the New Covenant what belongs properly to that of the Old.

We cannot offer here a detailed vindication of this criticism. This is hardly necessary in any case, as the refutation of the assumptions, on which the view criticised rests, has already, in great part, been accomplished in our previous expositions of the historical character of the Messianic prophecies. We shall present only some general points of view from which

[1] With this agrees Küper's verdict in *loc. cit.* pp. 480, 486.

its untenableness is easily recognisable,[1] and confine ourselves, in what remains, to a positive exhibition of the true state of the case.

It is, in the first place, absolutely *impossible* to work out the view in question in detail *with even a small measure of logical sequence.* There are obviously many of the Old Testament elements contained in prophecy which not even the most decided advocates of this view can assume will be fulfilled in the same way with others, *i.e.* according to their full historical sense, in reference to which rather they are compelled to have resort to the old allegorico-typical mode of exposition. We refer, by way of example, to the emphatic assertion of the difference between priests and laity, and of the privilege of the posterity of Zadok, as well as to the mention of sin- and guilt-offerings, and, in general, of animal sacrifice in the Messianic prophecy of Ezekiel. To apply here the literalistic method would involve a flat contradiction, not only of the clearest testimonies of the New Testament, but also of the Messianic prophecy of the Old Covenant itself; it is thus a case in which we must call to our aid some kind of typico-allegorical explanation. The inconsistency, however, of referring such features to the realm of allegory, while claiming a literal interpretation for most of the others, is assuredly not chargeable to Ezekiel, but to

[1] We must not, however, omit most cordially to recommend the advocates of the view to a fresh, candid, and thorough consideration of the excellent discussions of BERTHEAU, "Die alttestamentliche Weissagung von Israels Reichsherrlichkeit in seinem Lande," in the *Jahrbb. f. D. Theol.* 1859, pp. 314 ff. and 595 ff. and 1860, pp. 436 ff.

the expositor, who brings with him a false "principal key to the understanding of the prophetic word." [1] But once more: BERTHEAU has given deserved prominence to the fact that the announcement of the "imperial glory of Israel" [2] stands in the individual prophecies, almost throughout, in the closest connexion with that portion of their contents which relates to the historical circumstances of the time of their utterance, and that therefore the view, which expects its perfectly literal future fulfilment, can be logically carried out only upon the assumption of the recurrence of all these historical circumstances.[3] As this is essentially impossible,—inasmuch as the historical circumstances of one time exclude those of another,—and as none may venture upon the romantic assumption that, before the expected restitution of the kingdom of Israel, the empires of Assyria, and Babylonia—not to speak of the Philistines, the Edomites, the Moabites, and the Ammonites,—will again step upon the stage of universal history, as also that the disruption between the kingdom of Judah and that of the Ten Tribes will repeat itself in order to make its removal possible, it must be admitted that here also we cannot get beyond the traditional typico-allegorical mode of exposition. But what a net of inconsequence is here for the literalistic view! We are to take literally the announcement that the people of Israel will be assembled in the land of

[1] Words of AUBERLEN, *Der Prophet Daniel*, p. 388.
[2] [Part of the title of the work cited above.—TR.]
[3] Cp. BERTHEAU in *loc. cit.* 1859, pp. 356 f., 363.

Canaan, and form there, under the rule of the Son of David, a powerful flourishing State in the centre of the Kingdom of God upon earth; but we are not to take literally the announcements annexed to it, that they will reduce to subjection the remnant of Edom, the Philistines, Ammonites, and Moabites.[1] When Isaiah depicts the theocracy of the perfect time as a universal theocracy, embracing all the then known world, and consisting of three kingdoms, which, while independent of one another, yet enjoy peaceful mutual intercourse, and are all alike the property and the servants of Jehovah, Israel, as the chiefly blessed, aboriginal land of Jehovah, in the centre, Assyria and Egypt on its two respective sides,[2] we are to understand that what is said of Israel is meant literally, and will be exactly so fulfilled, but not what relates to Assyria and Egypt; in general, whenever Israel is mentioned, we are to understand the Israelitish nation; so soon, however, as the prophetic word names other peoples, it does not mean to designate the respective historical nationalities, but only to typify the world-kingdoms, which stand opposed to the theocracy! Thus does this literalistic conception of prophecy fail to extricate itself from the errors of the traditional typico-allegorical mode of interpretation, which it would fain improve, and is, with its half-measures and its inconsequence, only a degree more untenable than the latter.

Apparent also from the remarks just made is the very serious degree in which this literalistic theory

[1] Cp. *e.g.* Amos 9. 12, Isa. 11. 14. [2] Isa. 19. 23 ff.

fails to recognise the true *historical character of prophecy.* Very specially it fails to apprehend how for the prophets and their contemporaries even the nearly impending future is wholly transfigured by the light which falls upon it from the end of the ways of God, and how therefore the immediately impending times of salvation and grace are frequently depicted, as if their dawn were already the dawn of the perfect time.[1] A genuinely historical view of prophecy has, of course, in such cases to distinguish between an announcement which, under certain definite historical circumstances, peculiar to a particular time, places within a more or less near prospect deeds of grace and redemption to be wrought by God for His people Israel, and the ideal setting and colouring which this announcement derives from the fact that, in the consciousness of the prophet, the salvation promised to Israel and the salvation of the perfect time are merged together. To such a view, therefore, it will seem no more than natural that the actual times-fulfilment of the promise made to Israel should be only a relative fulfilment, and one that, at parts, necessarily falls considerably short both in internal significance and external glory of the picture projected by prophecy, and it will expect for the latter such higher and fuller accomplishment as will *correspond to its ideal substance,* and be characteristic of the last times. But it will never be able to regard this ultimate fulfilment as one that will, even in external respects, perfectly correspond with the *literal*

[1] Cp. pp. 152 f.

complex of the phrases used by prophecy; nor will it reckon as part of the ideal substance of prophecy those concrete elements which relate to the immediate fulfilment supplied by the subsequent history of Israel, as if these were to enjoy another and more brilliant fulfilment; nor, similarly, will it take leave to assume that the ideal substance of prophecy has a special validity for Israel, as if its proper fulfilment lay in the sphere of that nationality.

It is therefore to mistake the historical character of prophecy, and to ignore the lesson taught by the wider course of the history of the Kingdom of God as to the difference between the properly eschatological and the merely times-elements in the content of prophecy, to say: What was prophesied of Israel's conversion and glorious restitution to the promised land, was only very imperfectly fulfilled in the return from the Babylonian exile, and the doleful centuries of the restoration of the Old Testament theocracy; hence, unless we refuse altogether to believe in the fulfilment of prophecy, its fuller accomplishment is still to be looked for in a future assembling of converted Israel in the Holy Land, and in the imperial glory with which he will then be invested.[1] For that which belongs only to the first step of a mere times-fulfilment, this argument coolly transfers to the realm of eschatological fulfilment; what is in reality but the beginning of fulfilment is made the end.

Further, the conception of the prophecies of Israel's

[1] Cp. Auberlen, *Der Prophet Daniel*, pp. 391 f.

imperial power, which we here combat, is *opposed by analogy*. As we have seen, there are, within the Messianic prophecy of the Old Covenant, important differences in the degrees in which the envisaging forms of the Old Testament are insisted upon; at its highest pitches prophecy discards many of them, and thus itself warns us *not* to expect *any perfectly literal fulfilment* of such oracles. But, instead of following up this hint, and judging the whole case of the Old Testament envisaging forms of prophecy according to the analogy of such instances, the view in question—the moment it is applied with any degree of logical consistency — stints and limits the content of those more highly developed Old Testament prophecies which come nearest to the standard of New Testament assurance, in favour of a literal understanding of others that keep within the limits of the Old Testament forms. Instead of the letter of prophecy being judged in the light of those higher manifestations, in which every now and then the Spirit reveals itself more clearly, this very revelation of the Spirit of prophecy is again obscured by an insistence upon the letter.—There is, however, yet another and more complete analogy which is contravened by this view. It has already been shown how, according to the witness of the New Testament, the case stands with the conception that even in the Messianic time Jerusalem will remain the place of Jehovah's abode and revelation, and the centre of the theocracy. This conception, which in like manner pervades the entire scheme of Old Testament

prophecy, hangs together in the most indissoluble way with the prophecy of Israel's imperial glory in his own land. If, now, the warrant of this conception has been attested in the founding of the Kingdom of Christ by just such an historical fulfilment as was necessarily involved in a Divinely-ordained connexion between the Old and New Testament kingdom and people of God, which was not merely pretypical, but also organico-historical, but if, beyond this, the conception retains for the Kingdom of Christ only a symbolico-typical significance, it cannot be permissible to understand the announcement of Israel's imperial glory in his own land quite differently; on the contrary, it can be judged only in conformity with this analogy.

Yet once more, and finally, it must be pointed out that the view of our opponents, in order to favour the Israelitish nation, must, first of all, deny the applicability *to the Church of Jesus Christ* of most of the promises to whose comfort she has hitherto believed herself entitled. For it is affirmed of all the promises made to Israel as Jehovah's chosen and peculiar people—and they certainly form the great majority of the total number of promises—that they are valid, not only in their historical sense (which we decidedly admit), but also in their God-ordained ultimate reference to fulfilment in the historical scheme of saving revelation, for Israel as a people, as a nation. A Church essentially Gentile-Christian may only mediately regard them as promises given to her. Yet, as promises immediately available for her, there are

allowed to remain the prophecies of the incoming of the Gentiles to the Kingdom of God, and their participation in the salvation bestowed upon Israel, and these in turn will certainly confer the right, mediately to refer to herself the promises intended properly for the people of Israel in view of their future conversion. In no spirit of "Gentile pride,"[1] but under a grateful sense of the grace of God bestowed upon her, and supported, as we shall immediately see, by the testimony of the New Testament, the Church will always firmly protest against such a conclusion, and will reject the view, whose fruit it is, as unchurchly and heterodox.—But more than this: In order to glorify Israel, this view takes from *Christ Himself* His proper honour. For if Israel is destined to exercise a perpetual priesthood between God and humanity, and will in the Millennial kingdom of the future fulfil this destination, "imparting mediatorially to the nations the blessing of communion with God in a far other and more glorious way than hitherto,"[2] Christ is no longer the sole Mediator between God and men, for the mediatorship of Israel is interposed between Him and the rest of humanity in such a way as to make His mediatorial function depend for its efficiency upon the mediatorship of Israel. And if Israel's conversion and salvation are to be "the first real spiritual quickening of the Gentiles," it is again apparent that the full revelation and efficiency of

[1] Auberlen, *Abhandl.* p. 835.
[2] Auberlen, *Der Prophet Daniel*, pp. 389 f., and *Abhandl.* p. 803.

Christ as the *Pneûma zōopoioûn* ("quickening Spirit") for the nations and the Gentile Church, are conditioned by the attitude of Israel, being dependent upon a right fulfilment of his vocation by the latter, which is still in prospect. If, moreover, this view were applied to those prophecies which its advocates are accustomed to interpret as directly Messianic (although, in truth, in their historical sense they apply quite as much, in the first instance, to Israel as the people of God), *i.e.* to the entire prophecy concerning the servant of God,[1] the degree to which such an exaggeration of the historical sense of prophecy necessarily tends to diminish the honour of the name of Jesus Christ, and to fail in the recognition of the all-sufficiency of His saving work, would be yet much more apparent.

Many of the advocates, however, of the view we are combating do not go so far as, *e.g.*, Auberlen. They do not expect a perfectly literal fulfilment of the prophecy of Israel's imperial glory. It is acknowledged that much of it is, in the light of New Testament fulfilment, to be regarded as the Old Testament veil of the saving thoughts of God, and only the more general root-thought, that, even in his dispersion among the peoples of the earth, Israel will preserve his distinctive existence in view of his final destiny, and, when the times of the world-peoples are fulfilled, will, as a people, obey the call of the gospel and reassume his central position in the Divine Kingdom, is firmly retained as a prophecy that still awaits its fulfil-

[1] Cp. pp. 213 ff.

ment.[1] It is believed that we are compelled to regard this general root-thought as an element essential to the content of prophecy, partly by the fact that even in his dispersion Israel retains to this day a separate national existence,[2] partly by the testimony of the New Testament. The objections we have urged above lose their force against this modification of the view in question, and the line of argument used to support it. The only question is, has it really the witness of the New Testament on its side? For answer we address ourselves to the positive exhibition of the true state of the case.

Old Testament prophecy certainly does not recognise more than "a temporary rejection of Israel—one, too, that falls out in such a way that Israel does not perish as a people, but is preserved for his future home-bringing."[3] To appreciate properly the significance of this fact, there are two things of which we must not fail to take account. For one thing—the above proposition notwithstanding—the promises of the prophets do not avail for the nation of Israel as such. They do not belong to Israel-according-to-the-flesh, but they concern him only in so far as he is

[1] So, *e.g.*, OEHLER in the art. "Weissagung" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, pp. 658 f.

[2] "The miracle of Israel's preservation to this hour, while all the other nationalities of antiquity have been annihilated, or at least transformed beyond possibility of recognition through the admixture of foreign blood,—this double wonder, seeing that the other peoples remained in their settlements, while Israel was dispersed over the whole world, is the grand commentary of history on revelation."—AUBERLEN, *Der Prophet Daniel*, p. 392.

[3] Words of OEHLER in *loc. cit.*

really the chosen peculiar people of Jehovah; hence the prophecy of the sifting and purification of the people by the Divine judgments, and of the remnant preserved amid these judgments, out of which will emerge a renewed people of God. It is only in consequence of the Divine judgments, partly by extirpation of the obstinate evil-doers, partly by the conversion of the others and the general outpouring of the Spirit, that entire Israel becomes the true people of God, whose part it is to hope for the fulfilment of the promises. —And along with this it has to be remembered, secondly, that in the prophetic consciousness the preservation or, as the case may be, the restoration in general of a people and kingdom of *God* on earth, was indissolubly bound up with the continued existence of the people *Israel*. And *before the time was fulfilled*, and under the proviso that the saving work of God, begun in the election of Israel, should not be frustrated or require to be begun entirely afresh through Israel's own unfaithfulness, the relation thus assumed by the prophets to obtain between Israel and the Kingdom of God was actually in conformity with the facts. Undoubtedly, however, the main thing with the prophets, when they hold out the prospect of the future redemption of Israel from the power of the heathen, and the restoration of the Israelitish State, is the preservation of the people and kingdom of God upon earth, even although they do not consciously distinguish the wider from the narrower issue.—Whence it is at once apparent that *it does not at all correspond*

with the real sentiments of the prophets to represent the promises, made through them to Israel as Jehovah's peculiar people, as available for converted Israel as a nation, *in contradistinction and opposition to a people of God gathered meanwhile from among Israel and the heathen.*

Now, the promises in pre-Exilian and Exilian prophecy of the deliverance of Israel from Assyrian and Babylonian captivity, of his return and gathering into the holy land, of the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple, and the reconstruction of the shattered theocracy, were notoriously fulfilled upon Israel *as a people* in the times of Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Consequently they disappear from the contents of post-Exilian prophecy, which in but one other instance—that of Zech. 8. 7 f.[1]—announces freedom and home-bringing for those who were even then still captive in East and West, *i.e.* in all lands. This times-fulfilment fell certainly far short of the ideal delineations of the restoration of the theocracy projected by prophecy, and that, on a just reckoning, only partly in consequence of the fact that Israel had not yet turned to his God with his whole heart. For to the prophetic consciousness this restoration presented itself as at the same time the ultimate accomplishment of the Kingdom. In particular, there remained yet unfulfilled the prophecy, first announced with full clearness by

[1] It would be to mistake the apocalyptic mode of presentation, already prevalent in the night-visions of Zechariah, to adduce in this connection the passage Zech. 2. 10 ff.

Deutero-Isaiah, that God's intention in the election of Israel should now reach accomplishment; that Israel as the servant of Jehovah should, through fulfilment of his prophetic and priestly calling, accomplish upon all peoples God's saving purpose regarding humanity, and himself participate in that glory, at once royal and priestly, destined for him. This contrast between the times-fulfilment and the much more glorious content of the prophecy—constituting for the author of the Book of Daniel a problem which is solved, not by his own reflection, but by Divine revelation[1]—indicated that the redemption of Israel from the power of the Chaldeans and the restoration of the theocracy was to be regarded only as the beginning of the fulfilment of prophecy, and that the people of God had still to await its full fulfilment, and so there was assigned to post-Exilian prophecy the task of preserving alive in these doleful times the confident hope of the impending accomplishment of the kingdom of God.

And this hope was not put to shame. For in the very fact that, in the last centuries before Christ, Israel exercised unmistakably, through the medium of Alexandrian Judaism and the translation of the documentary sources of revelation into the language then spoken by the entire civilised world,[2] a purifying influence upon the religious conceptions of Greeks and Romans, and led many seeking souls among the heathen to the knowledge and worship of the true God, we have to recognise a further preparatory step on the

[1] Dan. 9.

[2] *I.e.* in the *Septuagint*.

road towards the fulfilment of the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah.—But it was only when the time was fulfilled that the promise given to Israel as the people of God was fulfilled, even in that portion of its contents which related to the accomplishment of the Kingdom. Salvation was "of the Jews."[1] Christ and His apostles were of the nation of Israel. The lost sheep of the house of Israel constituted the appointed sphere of Christ's personal ministry. His salvation was offered in the first instance to the Jews. Children of Israel formed the nucleus of the community of Jesus Christ, and were the first recipients of the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the heralds of the gospel as well for the Gentiles as for their own dispersed brethren. Thus the prophecy relating to the accomplishment of the Kingdom fulfilled itself, *as one given to the nation of Israel.* The facts of Christ's membership in that nation and of the organico-historical connexion of His Church with Jehovah's chosen peculiar people, add the seal of historical fulfilment to the announcement of the prophets that, conformably with the counsel of God, the promise of the Messianic salvation belonged to Israel as a people. The election of Israel and the conception of his central position in the Kingdom of God, which pervades the entire scheme of Old Testament prophecy, as well as the prophecy of his mediatorial mission as the bearer of saving revelation among the nations, received in this way their rights in the New Testament fulfilment.

But all Israel did not—the people as a people did

[1] John 4. 22.

not—participate in the salvation offered to them; only a remnant—only a select company—did, while the remainder, in impenitent obduracy, rejected salvation in the Crucified and Risen One.[1] Hence the Divine judgment of rejection went forth against Israel as a *people*, and, as had been already announced by the Lord Himself, the Kingdom of God was given to the Gentiles. The people of God continued to exist, not, however, in Israel as a nation, but in the New Testament community, which was composed of the "remnant" of Israel and of believers from among the Gentiles, received into the Kingdom of Christ as citizens and members of the household of faith. Elements, thus, that in the prophetic consciousness appear as indissolubly united—the conception of Israel as a nation and the idea of the people of God—are separated in the historical fulfilment. Side by side with Israel as a nation that, for the present world-era at least, has ceased to be the people of God and the trustee of the Divine revelation of salvation, there stands a people of God that, as regards its first members, proceeded from Israel (so fulfilling the prophetic oracle of the renewal from the "remnant"), but yet owed its existence chiefly to the accession of believers from among the Gentiles. Who, then, are the rightful heirs of the promises made to the covenant people of the Old Testament, so far as these promises are yet unfulfilled? For that they remain unfulfilled so long as the Kingdom of Christ does not embrace all peoples,

[1] Cp. Rom. 11. 1-10.

and so long as the glory of the Church of Christ fails of accomplishment or visible presentation, is undeniably certain.—Manifestly, the present rejection of Israel cannot be put on the same level with the earlier temporary repudiations in the times when the continuance of the kingdom and people of God on earth was still entirely dependent upon the continuance of the Israelitish nation. To apply the prophecies relating to these earlier repudiations baldly to the present rejection of Israel, is to ignore one of the most prominent facts of historical fulfilment, and the clue it supplies to a proper estimate of the Divine prophetic word; and it is, as we have seen, impossible to do justice to the sense actually attached to their utterances by the prophets themselves, unless we regard the New Testament people of God, and not the nation of Israel, as the heirs of the still unfulfilled promises given to the covenant-people of the Old Testament. In the light shed upon prophecy by the history of fulfilment, the New Testament people of God appears as its alone rightful heir. Of Israel, however, it has to be said: The fact that in him salvation has been prepared for the whole of humanity, proves the accomplishment of the object of his election, the fulfilment, once for all, of his vocation, as the historical bearer of revelation and salvation. Henceforth he participates in the promises given to the people of God only in so far as, and to the extent to which, he has entered or is entering the Church of Christ; and his participation is of precisely the same kind, and subject to the same con-

ditions, with Gentile believers; *i.e. individual Israelites* have part in the promises in so far as they become by faith members of the New Testament people of God, but they have no preference before other members. On the other hand, Israel's slighting as a nation of the day of his visitation, and his rejection of his Messias, have deprived him of all historical function as regards salvation and the Kingdom; and the promises of the prophets do not offer him any prospective restoration of his national distinctiveness, any central position in the Kingdom of God, any imperial glory, destined for him as a nation and to be enjoyed in his own land.

As against the objection that, in the Old Testament at least, Israel's election is represented as of eternal validity, it has to be remembered, first, that the Israelitish descent of Jesus Christ, and the rise of the Christian Church from the bosom of Israel, lend an eternal and far-reaching importance to the fact of Israel's election. The case is an exact parallel to that of the election of the house of David, of which the Old Testament speaks in similar terms, and which, in Christ's birth as the son of David, proves itself to have happened once for all. But, secondly, in reference to the rejection of Israel as a nation, it has to be maintained that in the Divine word of the Old Testament there is an *adh-ʿōlām* (for ever) that is meant only relatively,[1] and another which the Old Testament writers mean to be taken absolutely, but which, in the further course of the history of salvation, is lowered to

[1] Cp. *e.g.* Isa. 32. 14.

a position of relative validity, *i.e.* reveals itself as, in God's decree, meant only relatively. Such is the case with the eternal priesthood of the house of Aaron and its annexed eternal prerogatives;[1] with the eternal election of Jerusalem as Jehovah's dwelling-place; with the election for ever of the nation of Israel. The faithful covenant-God retains this election in validity up to the moment of His people's attaining, under His conduct, their predestined goal as implied in that election; but the "election for ever" can never, after the attainment of this goal, confine the reference of the further execution of His saving purpose to a people who, through their rejection of the offered salvation, have become incapable of serving as the human organ of its dissemination, and in whose stead He has prepared Himself another organ in the New Testament people of God.

This view of the case is supported by *the testimony of the New Testament.* Undoubtedly the latter asserts throughout that the promises of God were given in the first instance to the people of Israel, and that therefore their fulfilment also, the salvation in Christ, must be offered, and in the truth and faithfulness of God was offered, in the first instance to Israel, while the offer to the Gentiles, to whom God had given no covenant-promises, resulted from pure mercy.[2] The same is notoriously asserted both in word and deed by

[1] Cp. *e.g.* Ex. 40. 15, Num. 18. 19, 25. 13; also Jer. 33. 18 ff.

[2] Cp. the contrast between the *hypèr alētheías Theoû* and the *hypèr eléous* (for the sake of God's *truth*, . . . *mercy*) in Rom. 15. 8 f.

the apostle of the circumcision[1] as well as by the apostle of the Gentiles.[2] But both are equally unanimous in the opinion that, since the origin of the community of Jesus Christ, it is no longer Israel as a nation, but this community gathered from him and from the Gentiles, who compose the chosen, holy, priestly, peculiar people of God.[3] They are the true Israel of God,[4] the true seed of Abraham,[5] and hence the promises given to the Old Testament covenant-people are considered as available for them and as fulfilling themselves in them.[6] That within the New Testament community a Jewish or a Gentile origin makes no sort of difference as regards participation in the salvation offered in Christ and the conditions annexed to participation, that much rather those who were formerly heathen are fully qualified fellow-citizens with the saints, and fellow-heirs of the promises given to the seed of Abraham, is often enough expressly taught by the Apostle Paul.[7] It is precisely in this perfect equalising of Gentile and Jew in the Kingdom of Christ on the ground of the *immediacy* of the former's relation to Christ and to God, and of his

[1] Cp. *e.g.* Acts 2. 39, 3. 25 f.

[2] Cp. *e.g.* Acts 13. 46, Rom. 1. 16, 3. 1 f.

[3] Cp. 1 Pet. 2. 9 f., Rom. 9. 24 ff., 2 Cor. 6. 16, Tit. 2. 14. Even AUBERLEN cannot, of course, deny this; but he is of opinion that the case stands thus only "in the present world-era, in which Israel is rejected" (*Abhandlung*, p. 803).

[4] Gal. 6. 16, Rom. 9. 6 ff.

[5] Rom. 4. 16 ff., Gal. 3. 7. 29, 4. 28.

[6] Cp. the citations from Rom. 9. 25 f., 2 Cor. 6. 2. 16–18, Gal. 4. 27.

[7] Cp. Rom. 3. 29 f., 10. 12, 1 Cor. 12. 13, Gal. 3. 28 f., 6. 15, Eph. 2. 11–22, Col. 3. 11.

participation in salvation and the promises, *now that the hitherto prevalent ethnico-Israelitish character of the Theocracy was entirely removed,* that the *new* apprehension regarding the calling of the Gentiles into the Kingdom of Christ consists—of which the Apostle Paul says, that it was not made known to the former generations (Eph. 3. 5), inasmuch as, up to this time, the entrance of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God appeared always more or less as an entrance, at the same time, into the national communion of Israel, and their participation in salvation seemed to be mediated by its true recipient, Israel.[1]—With these unambiguous testimonies of the New Testament no sort of mediatorial priestly position of converted Israel is at all reconcilable. On the other hand, we have not found in them, as yet, any absolute exclusion of the possibility of Israel's taking, in spite of the equalisation above referred to, as a nation the foremost place in the organism of the perfected Kingdom of Christ. In this connexion, and not without reason, the relation between Jew and Gentile has been compared with that between man and wife.[2] But the New Testament would, in that case, necessarily require to attest this preference, still in store for the Jewish nation, with the same clearness and freedom from ambiguity with which it attests the perfect equalising of Jew and Gentile. We should expect such a testimony preëminently in

[1] Only in Isa. 19. 19 ff., and possibly also Zeph. 2. 11, this limit to the prophetic apprehension of the entrance of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God is to some extent broken through.

[2] Cp. Auberlen, *Der Prophet Daniel*, pp. 390 f.

the *Apocalypse*, the prophetic book of the New Testament. But just here we look for it in vain. This book tells indeed of 144,000 servants of God, *chosen from the twelve tribes of Israel*, who, preserved in the impending judgments, shall enter the glorified kingdom as conquerors, as distinguished from the innumerable company of those who have "overcome" from among all peoples of the earth;[1] but in the delineation of the last stages in the development of the Kingdom, as it hastens to its accomplishment, particularly in the announcement of the Millennial kingdom, no account whatever is taken of the difference between Israel and the heathen, nor is there, in general, any mention of converted Israel, albeit the names of the twelve tribes —as also that of Jerusalem—and many features of the prophecies, which treat of Israel's imperial glory, are employed in the description of the Kingdom of Christ in its perfected heavenly form. The assertion, that the gap of the Apocalypse is *to be filled up* from Old Testament prophecy, has in reality only the worth of an acknowledgment of this state of the case.[2] The

[1] Rev. 7. 4 ff.

[2] Hofmann in *loc. cit.* p. 656. Auberlen, *Der Prophet Daniel*, 1st ed. pp. 341 f. The attempts to explain this remarkable silence of the Apocalypse are as unsatisfactory as possible. Very naive is the following, *inter alia*, remark of Auberlen's: "The Apocalypse was intended for the Gentile Christian period; its design is to communicate to the New Testament community, gathered as it was chiefly from the Gentiles, what is necessary for it to know in its pilgrimage through the desert; it is its guide-book; it has to describe its fortunes. In view of this limited design no special account can be taken of Israel as a nation." As if it were not of the greatest consequence for the Gentile Church to know that she may expect the full blessing of

facts themselves convey the decisive proof that the seer in the Apocalypse, who surely had some skill in the "realism" of Scripture, and believed in the fulfilment of the promises of the faithful covenant God, could not have understood Old Testament prophecy as placing in prospect a fact of such importance to the history of the Kingdom as the reinstatement of the nation of Israel in its central position in that Kingdom. —It is alleged, however, that the apostle of the Gentiles gives us precisely what is lacking in the Apocalypse.[1] And certainly, in the passage referred to, the apostle does announce in the most definite manner that Israel's obduracy will last only until the full number of the Gentiles have entered the Church of Christ, and that then *all Israel* will be converted and saved. Here then we have a hopeful prophecy for the still impenitent totality of Israel — a prophecy, moreover, which is supported and confirmed by an appeal to a promise of full forgiveness, given to the Old Testament

communion with God, and the true spiritual revival only after the conversion and restoration of Israel as a people! In the 2nd ed. p. 385 this passage is omitted, and the whole stress is laid upon the 144,000 of Rev. 7. 4 ff. (*vid. sup.*) and upon "the grand general confirmation of all Old Testament prophecy" in Rev. 10. 7. But this "general confirmation" will have, we should suppose, to be understood in the sense which the succeeding prophecy of the Apocalypse itself naturally suggests.

[1] In Rom. 11. 25 ff., cp. ver. 15. We omit utterances of Christ such as Matt. 19. 28, 23. 39, 24. 34, which have been used to support the same position, as a candid exegesis altogether fails to show that they contain a prophecy of a future national restoration of Israel. Cp. on them Bleek, *Synoptische Erklarung der drei ersten Evangelien*, ii. pp. 272 and 382.

covenant people,[1] as well as by the fact that, with reference to Israel's election, the Jews are "beloved for their fathers' sake," for the "gifts and calling of God" (*i.e.* His calling to salvation) "are without repentance." Thus in fact, according to the testimony of the apostle, Israel's election and the promise given to him remain in force even for the people who are at present rejected; the Israelites have not forfeited for ever their natural rights as the next heirs to a Kingdom of God founded amongst them and for them; in the end they also will have their part in it. Still, let us beware of introducing into the text what is really not there. The apostle certainly speaks of Israel's totality, but the expression *pâs Israêl* (all Israel) by no means necessarily implies the giving of any special prominence to the Israelitish nationality, as an organism confined within itself, compact in the unity of a state, and thus asserting its national idiosyncrasy. Further, the apostle certainly speaks of Israel's reinstatement in the Kingdom of God, of their rescue, of their renewed pardon, but we read nothing of an historical mission of salvation which Israel is then to fulfil, or of a central position which he shall occupy in the Kingdom of God, or of a special imperial glory with which he shall be invested; nor is there one word of his being gathered into the Holy Land, or of the restitution of an Israelitish kingdom.[2]

[1] Isa. 59. 20 f.; cp. 27. 9.

[2] That Paul promises repentant Israel yet another missionary function in the history of salvation, is sought to be proved, partly from the expression *charísmata* (gifts), ver. 29, partly from the words *tís hē próslēpsis*

In this reference, its full weight should be allowed to the fact, that, of the promises given to Israel, the apostle chooses for citation just one of those which offer Israel the prospect of forgiveness and restored favour, but not of special glory. To whom, it might be asked, moreover, would Israel fulfil his alleged further prophetic and priestly calling in the way promised in Old Testament prophecy? Does not the apostle expressly place his conversion and re-acceptance in the time when *the full number of the Gentiles have already entered the Kingdom of God!*[1] So far, indeed, from being aware of any saving mediatorial mission, which converted Israel should have to fulfil towards the Gentiles, he regards, on the contrary, the rich revelation of the Divine mercy

ei mè zoè ek nekrôn ("what the receiving of them," etc.), ver. 15. The former expression, however, cannot in the context in which it occurs denote *special* gifts of grace imparted to Israel *for the fulfilment of his calling*, but only the blessings of salvation which belong to the Kingdom of God. (*Charismata*, as in Rom. 5. 15 f. 6. 23; it can hardly be translated "exhibitions of grace," as the LXX. never renders the Hebrew *chăṣādhîm*—which is used in this sense—by *charismata*, but by *tà* elée (compassions) or the like.) And the latter expression (the *tis hē*, etc., ver. 15)—however we choose to understand the *zoè ek nekrôn* (on which see Meyer)—does not, at any rate, imply that life from the dead is to proceed from Israel, in virtue of his exercising a mediatorial function in reference to salvation, but only that the conversion and reacceptance of Israel must precede the accomplishment of salvation.

[1] Opposed to this is the view given in Auberlen's sketch of the consequences of Israel's restitution: "There is no longer any need of a toilsome pursuit of the Gentiles, they come in of themselves, attracted by the sight of the rich gifts of the Divine revelation of grace" (*Der Prophet Daniel*, p. 402). And: "Israel is to be a kingdom of priests, bringing salvation to all peoples" (*Abhandl.* p. 835).

to the Gentiles as the first means by which Israel is led to repentance with a view to participation in the same mercy.[1] Obviously, thus, the prospect of restoration offered to Israel is only one of those promises to which the saying is applicable: "The first shall be last."[2] As is perfectly apparent from Rom. 11. 32, it hangs together with the prophecy—once and again repeated by Paul—of the ultimate unqualified universality of the possession of salvation, account being taken, however, of the fact that, in Israel's case, the common hope has *special supports* in his election and the promises committed to him. Israel's election and the promises given to him remain thus in force for the people, who have been rejected because of their obduracy, *just so far* as they guarantee that Israel has not been cast away for ever, has not forfeited irrecoverably the salvation in Christ, but will eventually have his own share in it. On the other hand, no special preference is promised even in Rom. 11 to converted Israel above Gentile believers.[3]

[1] Rom. 11. 31, cp. vv. 11 and 14.

[2] Cp. BERTHEAU in *loc. cit.* (1859) p. 325: "In the few passages [of the New Testament] which allow us to glance at Israel's future, he does not appear as a triumphant first-fruits among the peoples who participate in the bliss of the Divine Kingdom, but as one born late, who yet, by God's grace, is allowed a share in the beatification."

[3] The fact of the national continuity of Israel in his dispersion cannot, in these circumstances, prove that some further historical mission for the Kingdom of God is in store for that nation. We do not need to ask here the historical reason and ground of this continuity, or to enter upon the question, how long it may yet be expected to last. Suffice it to say, that Rom. 11, along with other New Testament passages, shows the facts in a different light by

The clearest and weightiest attestation of the above argument on the relation of Israel as a nation to the New Testament Theocracy (pp. 256 ff.), is that offered by the Gospel of John.—For this Gospel is wholly dominated by the view that, because of their slighting the Messianic salvation manifested in Christ, the Jews, *as a nation*, have ceased to be the people of God, have become, on the contrary, the type of the God-estranged world, and that their place is occupied by a community compacted without regard to the nationality of its members—that, viz., of those who have become children of God through Christ.[1]—The New Testament thus both sanctions and demands our distinguishing, in the prophetic oracle of the future imperial glory of Israel in his own land, between the Old Testament mode of presentation and the eternal saving thoughts of God. The Israelitish descent of the Saviour of the world, the organico-historic connexion of the New Testament people of God with Israel, the conservation of Israel's priority of claim to the promised salvation, serve as the historical fulfilment of this oracle, and attest it as one in harmony with the purpose of God. In so far, however, as it remains yet unfulfilled, it must, regarded in

representing the Jewish nation as affording, first of all, by its rejection of salvation in Christ, an example of Divine judgment, but, ultimately, an all the more brilliant example of His mercy and faithfulness.

[1] Cp. A. H. Franke, *Das Alte Testament bei Johannes*, 1885, pp. 17 ff., 243 ff., and *my* remarks in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1885 pp. 566 ff.

the light of the New Covenant and the New Testament word of God, be assigned, like other prophecies, to the realm of the typico-Messianic. It is in harmony with the Divine intention, in the scheme of historical revelation, that all the utterances of prophecy, which in their historical sense speak of the imperial glory of Israel in the last times, should be referred to the future glorious manifestation of the Church of Christ, the New Testament people of God; and the fact that prophecy assigns the prospect of this glory to Israel, is only an Old Testament veil of the Divine saving thoughts.[1]

A view, largely supported in modern times (though by no means solidly founded),[2] to the effect that the Davidic descent of Christ cannot be maintained from the standpoint of a critical examination of the evangelic history, suggests at once the question, whether the *Davidic descent of the Messias* is not one of those Old Testament envisaging forms by which prophecy abides, but to which New Testament fulfilment warrants us in assigning only a typico-

[1] In spite, therefore, of its unhistorical character, the old churchly view of these prophecies, which HENGSTENBERG revived (particularly in his paper, "Die Juden und die christliche Kirche," *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, May 1857), is essentially correct as regards its main result, and is vastly preferable to the Judaising view we have been discussing. The remark of Keil is much to the point: "*Through Christ the promise is exalted from its times-form to its essence*, through Him the whole earth becomes Canaan" (*Genesis*, p. 146, 2nd ed.). Cp. also the detailed discussion of the whole question in the same author's *Commentary on Ezek.* pp. 347 ff. and 497 ff.

[2] The verdict even of KEIM, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, i. pp. 326 ff. [Eng. Transl. vol. ii. pp. 25 ff.].

symbolical significance. In the attempt to answer this question affirmatively reference might be made to the disentanglement of the Messianic prospects from the Davidic kingship, and the appropriation to the people of God of the promises of grace, given to David, which we find in Deutero-Isaiah, as well as to the fact that in Daniel the Messias is not characterised as the son of David; and these facts might be thought to imply a favourable witness from the Old Testament itself to the conclusion sought to be established.[1] The previous course of our argument, however, carries with it both the fact and the reason of a negative answer. The Davidic descent of the Messias is on the same footing with the requirement that salvation should come from the Jews. It was the fulfilment required to do justice to the election of a royal Davidic house, and to the promises given to it, on which the truth and faithfulness of God were staked.—On the other hand, there are certainly other more isolated features in the Messianic prophecies in whose case the essence of the prophecy is exhibited in severance from its temporary mode of presentation only in the fulfilment. In this connexion Malachi's prophecy deserves special mention, that the prophet Elias will, as preparer of the way, precede a God who is coming for judgment and the accomplishment of salvation.[2] For the prophet can hardly have called the preparer of the way Elias merely in a sense parallel to that of the name David (*i.e.* a *second* David),

[1] Cp. pp. 191 ff. [2] Mal. 4. 5 f.; cp. 3. 1.

as baldly applied to the Messias;[1] the expectation, rather, of the personal return of Elias, *who had not died, but had been withdrawn to heaven,*—an expectation widely diffused even in the time of Christ, and prevalent among Jews, Mohammedans, and Christians, (till the Reformation), — appears to be in entire accordance with the meaning of the prophet. That, however, this prophecy was fulfilled in John the Baptist, is notoriously attested, not only by the evangelists, whose report of the appearance and preaching of John carefully emphasises his resemblance to Elias, but also by the Lord Himself in repeated expressions.[2] Here also, in the light of the New Testament fulfilment, the essential ideal substance of the prophecy is separated from the typico-symbolical envisaging form in which it was realised in the consciousness of the prophet. In His significant *ei thélete déxasthai*,[3] Matt. 11. 14, Christ Himself draws attention to the contrast between the interpretation of prophecy that is captive to its literal historical sense, and that understanding which grasps its essential substance, and hence does not fail to mark a fulfilment *already past*.[4]

[1] Hos. 3. 5, Jer. 30. 9, Ezek. 34. 23, 37. 24.

[2] Matt. 11. 14, 17. 10 ff.

[3] *If ye will receive it.*

[4] It is remarkable that the advocates of the Judaising view of the prophecies of Israel's imperial glory have not included the personal return of Elias among their eschatological expectations (cp., however, Hofmann in *loc. cit.* ii. p. 103)—the more that they would have on their side the view, prevalent in the Church till the Reformation, according to which the fulfilment in John the Baptist is only temporary, while the perfect fulfilment is to take place immediately before the Parousia. Christ, however, would certainly use His *ei thélete déxasthai* to point the contrast between the fulfilment of the

4. The proof, however, of the incongruity between Old Testament prophecy and New Testament fulfilment, which results from the times-adapted and specifically Old Testament elements which prophecy contains, *i.e.* from its symbolico-typical character, gives by no means a complete view of the difference between the two factors at present under comparison. Besides this incongruity, there are other respects in which Messianic prophecy *fails to exhibit any full apprehension* of the Divine purpose which attains accomplishment in the New Covenant. That purpose is fully revealed only in its actual carrying out. *One* main ground—though not the only one—of this imperfection lies in the fact that, by its method of starting at different times from different ideas, contained in the Old Testament religion and embodied in the Old Testament theocracy, and developing thence their several Messianic contents,[1] prophecy *succeeds in apprehending*, under manifold combinations, *only individual fragmentary moments of the saving purpose of God, without being able to exhibit them in the connexion in which, in the fulfilment, they are compacted into a uniform whole.* What the Apostle Paul says of New Testament prophecy: *ek mérous prophēteúomen*,[2] is true in a much greater measure of that of the Old Testament. The *polumérōs* of Heb. 1. 1[3] is very

prophecies of Israel's imperial glory and mediatorial vocation in Himself and His community, and their confinement to their literal historical sense.

[1] Cp. pp. 175 ff. [2] *We prophesy in part*, 1 Cor. 13. 9.

[3] *In many parts*, cp. my *Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes*, pp. 89 and 92.

marked even in its Messianic prophecy.[1] We shall endeavour — within the limits of our space — to exhibit, by a reference to the salient points, the extent to which a knowledge of the saving purpose of God, which is realised in the New Covenant, was already implied in Old Testament prophecy, and the extent to which the latter falls short of the sublimity and wealth of New Testament fulfilment.

(*a*) The prophecy that comes nearest the New Testament, as regards apprehension of saving truth, is that concerning the *final condition of the people and kingdom of God.* Although it is often, especially in the oldest prophecies, the external side of the Messianic salvation—which, however, is always regarded as the consequence and blessing of a perfected communion with God—that is made prominent, it happens, nevertheless, not unfrequently that the spiritual salvation in which the people of God participate in the last days receives the chief place. In particular: the complete and universal *forgiveness of sins,* as the result of a new and all-sufficient exhibition of the pardoning grace of God, and the thorough *ethico-religious renewal* of hearts and of the entire public life, in consequence of *the outpouring of the Spirit of God* upon all the members of the nation without exception, and of His *indwelling* in hearts, advance steadily with the development of Messianic prophecy to the position of the chief saving

[1] Cp. Oehler, art. "Weissagung" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie,* xvii. p. 655. *Theologie des Alten Testamentes,* ii. § 216.

benefits of the Messianic era.[1] The covenant-communion of Israel with Jehovah culminates in an *immediate personal communion of love between all individuals and God,* Who then *dwells substantially and for ever in the midst of His people,* reveals Himself in all the fulness of His glory and grace for all, and in the diffusion of salvation and blessing manifests His gracious presence in full measure; Who also, in particular, by the mighty workings of His Spirit, immediately enlightens and rules all individuals, making them His organs, adapted habitually to share His confidence and receive His revelations, so that only the extraordinary experiences of the Spirit's work and of revelation which occurred in the peculiar domain of prophecy, can serve to illustrate what will then be the common experience of all.[2] Then the people of God will become a people truly *holy* in all its members,[3] a *priestly* people,[4] a congregation of the *righteous,*[5] *children of the living God.*[6] The law will no longer stand between God and His people in the form of civil statutes externally imposed; but it will be written on the hearts of all by the Spirit, *i.e.* every one will then bear within himself a clear living knowledge of the will of God, which will serve as a powerful inward impulse

[1] Cp. esp. Joel 2. 28 ff., Isa. 29. 18. 24, 30. 19 ff., 32. 3 f. 15, 33. 24, Micah 7. 18 ff., Zech. 12. 10, 13. 1 ff., Jer. 3. 21 ff., 24. 7, 31. 29 ff., 32. 39 f., 33. 8, 50. 20, Ezek. 11. 19 f., 16. 63, 36. 25 ff., 37. 23, 39. 29, Isa. 44. 3.

[2] Cp. Joel 2. 28 ff., Hos. 2. 18 ff., Jer. 31. 31 ff., Isa. 45. 7–10. 13, 65. 24.

[3] Isa. 4. 3, 35. 8, Dan. 7. 18. 22. 27.

[4] Isa. 61. 6, 66. 21.

[5] Isa. 60. 18. 21.

[6] Hos. 1. 10.

towards a godly life, and thus the New Covenant will be an eternal covenant, not exposed to any risk of dissolution through the people's unfaithfulness.[1] This perfecting of covenant-communion involves a fundamental alteration of the entire Old Testament ritual of worship—even of the entire Old Testament economy. The position and function of a special priesthood and prophecy[2] as the mediators of salvation and revelation, the limitation of the gracious presence and revelation of Jehovah to the external sanctuary of the temple, and the external worship, consisting in the offering of animal-sacrifices, fall away as things that belong only to the present still imperfect form of covenant-communion.[3] —In these deep glances—noticeable very specially in Jeremiah—into the essence of perfected communion with God, as regards its difference from what had previously prevailed, there is implied the further perception, that *the Kingdom of God* will no longer be first and foremost a politico-national theocracy, but pre-eminently a spiritual Kingdom, the communion of those who have communion with God. Elsewhere, however, it is chiefly depicted with reference, in addition, to the external form which it will ultimately acquire as a Kingdom in which God Himself conducts the government in a far more perfect way than in the existing theocracy. It is then, as the people of God, holy, thoroughly purified of all that characterises the

[1] Jer. 31. 31 ff., 32. 40.

[2] *Prophetentum.*

[3] Jer. 31, 34, Isa. 54. 13, 61. 6, 66. 21.—Jer. 3. 16 f.—Hos. 14. 2, Isa. 56. 7.

kingdoms of the world, all that it embraces is subordinated to the holy will of Jehovah, and devoted to His service;[1] in it will reign right and righteousness, truth and peace. Its holiness, further, will manifest itself externally in perfected glory,[2] and to the spiritual salvation of perfected communion with God there will correspond the richest fulness of earthly blessings,—a stream of blessing proceeding from a God who dwells in the midst of His people, fulfils all the longings and yearnings of the human heart, and gives life and full satisfaction.[3]—Those whom the law excludes from the community of Israel will also have part in the destined salvation.[4] But especially it is decreed that all peoples shall have part in it, for they will be incorporated with the people of God, and the Kingdom of God will become a universal theocracy, extending itself over the whole earth.[5] For even Old Testament prophecy exhibits a clear perception of the Divine will that all should be saved and come to the knowledge of the

[1] Zech. 14. 20 f.

[2] The most minute, sublime, and brilliant delineations of this glory are those given by Deutero-Isaiah. Thus, *e.g.*, in illustrating the glory of the city of God he represents the most precious and glittering things of earth—gold, silver, and the most beautiful pearls—as employed in its construction (Isa. 54. 11 f., 60. 17), while it is adorned with plantations of the loveliest trees (60. 13).

[3] The earnest and symbol of this is the temple-spring, which becomes a stream abounding with water, and transforming the holy land into Paradise (Joel 4. 18, Zech. 14. 8, Ezek. 47. 1 ff.). On the all-sufficiency of the God who is enthroned in the midst of His people, cp. also Isa. 60. 19 f. The city of God has no more need of sun or moon, for Jehovah is her eternal light.

[4] Isa. 56. 3 ff.

[5] See pp. 205 ff.

truth. The announcement that the Kingdom of God will take the place of the shattered kingdoms of the world, implies the view that its external perfection will be accomplished by a judicial catastrophe.[1]—Finally, Old Testament prophecy is not without the idea of an ultimate removal of every evil that has entered the world through sin.[2] It speaks of the restoration of the whole creation to more than its original perfection.[3] It tells of a new heaven and new earth which God will create;[4] and, in particular, of a future destruction of the dominion of death,[5] and a resurrection of the dead,[6] which, according to the prophecy in Daniel, will be twofold, —for some to everlasting life, for others to everlasting contempt,[7] the final judgment being thus conceived as including the already deceased members of the people of God.

If we attempt to realise all this in the wealth of manifold detail offered by the individual prophecies, we shall be forced to admit that the prophecy of the Old Covenant disclosed a prospect of the final condition of the kingdom and people of God which approximates to New Testament assurance. Still the distance between the two is considerable; the difference, moreover, does not lie merely in the general superiority of the latter to the views of the prophets as regards the clearness and fulness of its knowledge of saving truth. We do

[1] Dan. 2. 34. 44, 7. 14. 18. 22. 27.
[2] Cp. *e.g.* Isa. 33. 24.
[3] Hos. 2. 18. 21 f., Isa. 11. 6 ff. 30. 26, 65. 25.
[4] Isa. 65. 17, 66. 22.
[5] Isa. 25. 8.
[6] Isa. 26. 19.
[7] Dan. 12. 2 f.

not seek to attach any special importance to individual points, as, *e.g.*, that the resurrection of the dead appears even in the Book of Daniel as confined to deceased Israelites, while in the entire range of the Old Testament prophecy there is not a word of a general resurrection of the dead. Nor need we more than refer once again to the limitations of the prophets' apprehensions of saving truth involved in the specifically Old Testament conceptions explained above. Just these limitations, however, hang together with another of a very essential kind—that, viz., implied in the fact that, in spite of Deutero-Isaiah's prophecy of the new heaven, only the *this-side*, only, *i.e.*, the terrestrial world, appears as the sphere of the Kingdom of God erected for His people, and as the scene of the accomplished salvation. The curtain that concealed the *other-side*, *i.e.* the heavenly world, is not yet removed. That the Theocracy of the perfect time will, as a Kingdom of heaven, include the world beyond, and thus heaven also be opened to the people of God, is not prophesied. While, therefore, prophecy brings to light the ultimate glorified form of the Kingdom of God *on earth*, it fails to present the *heavenly* character of the Kingdom of Christ. Hence, in spite of the announcement of an abolished dominion of death and a resurrection of the dead, prophecy still fails to offer to the godly the comforting prospect of finding in death an entrance into the blessedness of perfected communion with God in heaven. The living hope, gifted to us through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, goes thus far beyond

what is promised in the Messianic prophecy of the Old Covenant.[1]

(*b*) Old Testament prophecy is not behindhand with the distinct testimony that Israel does not attain perfect fellowship with God by his own instrumentality or power, but that rather its establishment and, in general, the bringing about of the perfect state of the people and kingdom of God, are throughout God's very own work—the work of His free grace. He takes away the sins of His people, not because of their desert, but for His holy name and truth's sake,[2] and He does so by devising, in place of the insufficient means of propitiation provided in the Old Covenant, new and effective ordinances for purification from sin.[3] By the outpouring of His Spirit He effects the repentant conversion,[4] the heart-renewal, the willing obedience, with one consent, of His commandments. In general, it is His judgment and His deed of redemption which effect the consummation. But in the carrying out of His saving purpose He does not refuse to employ *mediating organs*. And here foremost attention must be claimed for *the Messias*, with whose appearance Messianic prophecy associates, particularly in the Assyrian period,

[1] Cp. Delitzsch, *Isaiah* (3rd ed. p. 668): "The Old Testament throughout fails to teach anything regarding a blessed *beyond*. Beyond this world lies Hades. The Old Testament betrays no knowledge of a heaven of blissful human beings. Only angels, not men, surround the heavenly throne of God,"—propositions wholly applicable to the content of Old Testament prophecy, and limitable only as regards Enoch and Elijah.

[2] Ezek. 16. 33, 36. 31 f., Isa. 43. 25, 48. 9. 16.

[3] Zech. 13. 1, Ezek. 36. 25.

[4] Zech. 12. 10 ff.

the dawn of the perfect time. It is no Messias, appearing in lowliness and the form of a servant, who is announced. What undoubtedly is presupposed is that before the dawn of the Messianic time both the people and the royal house of David will have, through Divine judgment, experienced the utmost humiliation, and, accordingly, that in the Messias both, and especially the latter, will again be uplifted to glory. Hence in Isa. 11. 1 the Messias is a branch from the hewn stem of Jesse; hence it is that in Micah 5. 2 he issues forth, like the first David, from the small, inconspicuous Bethlehem; hence it is that, in Ezek. 17. 22 ff., he is an offshoot taken from the lofty cedar of the royal Davidic house, and planted anew,—an offshoot in which the latter renews its youth, and grows again a glorious cedar. He does not, moreover, like a worldy conqueror, lay the foundations of his power with the implements of martial prowess. Rather like the *'ănîyyê Yah'veh* (Jehovah's poor ones), he is meek and lowly, far removed from all self-exaltation and violence, riding, not upon a proud war-horse, but on the peaceable foal of an ass, a strong king of peace, only by the power of God mighty to help and save.[1] Yet, for all this, the picture of the Messias is not that of the Son of Man, who had not where to lay His head; Old Testament prophecy invests him always rather, even in his lowly circumstances, with God-given kingly glory.

On the other side, however, not even the delineation of his glory comes up to the glory of the Messias

[1] Zech. 9. 9; cp. Oehler, art. "Messias," pp. 417 f.

who has appeared in Jesus Christ. He is represented as a human king, an offspring from the stem of David, whose eminence is far above the position of all other men, and whose personality has about it something wonderful and mysterious. Although it is nowhere indicated that he is to enter the world in an extraordinary and wonderful manner,[1] he yet, as the earthly representative of the Divine King, and His instrument in establishing His kingdom and exercising His governmen, stands in an absolutely unique and intimate relationship to God, Whose Spirit rests upon him as on no other, and Whose almighty power, wisdom, righteousness, and helpful grace work through him in such full measure, that in and through his government God's great name, *i.e.* His revealed glory, is made known. In other words, God makes him the organ of His Self-revelation, just as elsewhere He uses the "angel of Jehovah." Hence even the Divine designation *'ēl gibbōr* (God-hero) is one of the names ascribed to him;[2] and hence also, even in a more general announcement applied to the house of David,[3] there occurs the expression: "it shall be as *God* and the *angel of Jehovah* before" the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Both in the Kingdom of God and in humanity the Messias assumes thus a central position,[4] not only as their head, but also as the mediating organ whence proceed the judicial and saving operations and the Self-revelation of

[1] We cannot, with THOLUCK (in *loc. cit.* p. 170), regard Isa. 7. 14 as a directly Messianic prophecy. On Micah 5. 1, cp. p. 185.

[2] Isa. 9. 6. [3] Zech. 12. 8. [4] Isa. 11. 10.

the Divine King.[1] In that late apocalyptic aftershoot of Old Testament prophecy, the Book of Daniel, finally, the eminence of the Messias above all other men, and his unique intimate relation to God, are emphasised still more strongly, for, without reference to his origin, he is described as one wearing a human form, and yet *coming on the clouds of heaven*—a phrase applied elsewhere to Jehovah Himself.[2]—And yet even this Old Testament picture of the Messias falls strikingly short of the New Testament God-Man;[3] great as is the glory of the Messias, who mediates the revelation of the name of Jehovah, it is yet not the glory of the only-begotten Son of God; the mystery that in the Messias the eternal Son of God should enter the world as man, to accomplish God's purpose of love, became actually manifest only when the time was fulfilled.—In Old Testament prophecy, however, there stands, side by side with the reference to the future Messias, a reference also to the final visible *appearance of Jehovah Himself*, who comes to His people to judge, and to perfect salvation, taking up His abode for ever in their midst, and manifesting perfectly, and to all visibly, His glory and grace.[4] And this visible Self-revelation

[1] Pp. 179 ff., esp. pp. 182 ff. [2] Dan. 7. 13 f. See pp. 194 ff.

[3] The difference would be less if it turned out that recent Christological representations, which hold to the conception of the God-Man, but drop the idea of the personal preëxistence of the Son, were a sufficient expression of the New Testament view. The kinship of the latter to the Old Testament picture of the Messias—a kinship which, in view of the specifically Old Testament form of Monotheism, cannot be considered accidental—has not yet received proper attention.

[4] Cp. pp. 201 f., and besides the passages there cited, the as yet less

of God is, according to Mal. 3. 1, one that is mediated by the angel of Jehovah, in whom is the name of God.[1] But although thus this announcement approximates to the other, which depicts in the Messias a like personal organ of the Self-revelation of God, yet the two representations are nowhere resolved into each other;[2] they stand, unmediated, side by side, a proof-instance of the *ek mérous prophēteúomen* ("we prophesy in part").—A further proof of the same result lies in the fact that in not even a single instance does the Messias appear as the sole human organ of the saving operations of Jehovah, which effect the consummation. For, irrespective of the Messianic passages which speak of a plurality of successive Davidic kings, or of several[3] saviours, there stand alongside of the Messias, as trustees of a saving mediatorial function, Deutero-Isaiah's *servant of God, i.e.* the community of the Old Covenant, who, as the service staff of Jehovah, are entrusted with a prophetic commission to humanity and Zechariah's *Messi-*

developed forms of the same prophecy in Joel 3. 21 and similar passages; further, in Zech. 9. 14, Isa. 4. 5 f., Zech. 14. 3 ff., and Isa. 24. 23.

[1] Ex. 23. 21.

[2] Cp. Oehler, *Prolegomena zur Theologie des Alten Testamentes*, pp. 67 f., and art. "Messias" in Herzog's *Realencyklopädie*, pp. 408 f. —Passages such as Ezek. 34. esp. ver. 24, cannot be adduced in proof of the contrary, as in them the Messias is placed beside God only as the organ through whom Jehovah Himself exercises His pastoral oversight of His flock, just as elsewhere God and the king are placed together (Prov. 24. 21, Hos. 3. 5, 1 Sam. 12. 3. 5, Ps. 2. 2). Such prophecies are therefore to be ranked only with the former of the two above classes; they say nothing of a visible appearance of Jehovah Himself. On Dan. 10. 5 ff., see above, p. 196, footnote.

[3] Obad. ver. 21.

anic high priest;[1] so far as the function of executing the saving purpose of God relating to the final consummation is not immediately ascribed to Jehovah Himself, it is divided among these agents.

(*c*) This implies that the fragmentary character of the Messianic apprehensions of the prophets must appear to a great extent even in the representation of the Messianic *work of salvation.* The Messias is indeed represented as the mediator, from whom proceed the Divine Messianic saving operations; but this is so only in cases where these are considered as an exercise of *royal* ruling functions in and for the kingdom of God. Everywhere he appears *only as king,* and his saving Messianic work consists in the deliverance of the people of God from the power of their enemies, the securing of the theocracy, the perfect vindication therein of right and righteousness, its extension over all peoples, the establishment upon earth of the eternal kingdom of peace. By his kingly rule the Kingdom of God becomes, what it is meant to be, a kingdom in which evil is abolished for ever, and none injures his neighbour; a kingdom filled with the living apprehension of Jehovah, and therefore with righteousness and peace.[2] In short, *the Messianic salvation is mediated by him as regards all blessings which accrue to the people of God by a perfect representation*[3] *of the royal government, and a full vindication of the royal will of Jehovah.*—On the other hand, Old Testament prophecy knows *nothing* of a *prophetic*

[1] Pp. 199 f. [2] Pp. 183 ff. [3] *Uebernahme.*

function of the Messias; he indeed makes known the will of God, makes it known even to the nations, but not as a prophet, teaching, exhorting, comforting, but as a king, commanding, ordaining, judicially discriminating and deciding.[1]—Just as little does Old Testament prophecy represent the Messias as, in a proper sense, a *high priest*. It speaks, indeed, of his enjoying a priestly nearness to Jehovah,[2] but only in illustration of the intimate relation of inward fellowship, in which he personally, as king, stands to God, not in the sense of ascribing to him the function of a priest, mediating salvation. It represents the high priest as a type of the Messias,[3] conceiving the latter thus as a priest-king, but not again because he offers sacrifices in expiation of the people's sin, but only in so far as he is himself a person in the highest degree consecrated to God, and entitled to near access to Him, and in so far as he is the head and representative of a priestly people, purified from their sins and holy. Once more, it characterises the government of the Messianic theocracy as both a kingly *and high-priestly*, and yet a perfect unity; but not by assigning the high-priestly function to the Messias, but by placing beside him on the throne a Messianic high priest, who, one with him in mind and spirit, shares the conduct of the government.[4]—We have, indeed, every reason to object to the assertion that the suffering and expiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ

[1] Isa. 11. 10, Zech. 9. 10.
[2] Jer. 30. 21.
[3] Zech. chaps. 3 and 6.
[4] Pp. 199 f.

were not foretold by the prophets, as though in this matter there were no connexion at all between Old Testament prophecy and New Testament fulfilment; no one who considers the relation of the two otherwise than with absolute superficiality will stand for a moment to any such assertion. It is true, nevertheless, that the prophecy of the Old Covenant does not know of a *Messias who suffers and dies:* it is also true that it *nowhere* ascribes to the Messias an official function *of mediating the forgiveness of sins*, or effecting an *ethico-religious renewal of hearts*,[1] and that, in general, it does *not* represent *perfected personal fellowship with God in love* as *mediated* by him. On the other hand, however, it announces distinctly and definitely not only—as already remarked—that God will devise new and sufficient ordinances for expiating His people's sin,[2] and will effect the renewal of hearts by His Spirit, but also that a mighty *redemptive act of God the Saviour*, an act, exhibiting in the most glorious way the superabundant grace of God for Israel and the whole world, will yield at once salvation and

[1] The title of the Messias in Jer. 23. 6, *Yahvèh tsidhkēnu* (Jehovah our righteousness), imports undoubtedly that Jehovah Himself will through the Messias, as His organ, put His people into a condition of perfected legal qualification (*Rechtbeschaffenheit*), and will by the same means grant them the privilege of an actual justification (*Gerechtsprechung*), consisting of deliverance, salvation, and security. That what is meant by this, however, is the restoration by *kingly government* of the legal constitution and well-being of the *life of the people as a whole*, is clear from what is said in ver. 5 of the work of the righteous branch of David. Hence it was possible, as in Jer. 33. 16, to apply the name to the capital, as representing the people of God.

[2] Zech. 13. 1, Ezek. 36. 25.

consummation. It is true that in such predictions the prophets speak of the impending deliverance from the power of Assyria and Babylon, so that even here prophecy does not lose its symbolico-typical character. But this deliverance from the power of the world-kingdoms, and from an extremity of judgment, is at the same time a deliverance of the people of God from *all* their distress; just with it is connected the full forgiveness of sins, and by it also Israel is cured of his blindness and hardness of heart. By it God purchases His people anew to Himself for a possession; it marks the accomplishment of a second higher election—an event in which for the first time the promise: "I will be their God, and they shall be my people," attains full verification, in which, *i.e.*, the perfect fellowship with God of His people is for the first time established. Hence it is frequently compared with the first historical accomplishment of the election, the deliverance of Israel from Egypt; and it is declared that it will put this event, constituting as it did for the Old Testament religion the foundation of certainty regarding Israel's election, wholly into the shade.[1]

But we have not yet exhausted the prophetic apprehension of salvation. For prophecy announces further a *prophetic and priestly mediator of salvation*, through whom the saving purpose of God concerning Israel and humanity reaches accomplishment. There

[1] Cp. *e.g.* Isa. 10. 26, 11. 11. 16, chap. 12, Micah 7. 15, many passages in Deutero-Isaiah, and esp. Jer. 16. 14 f., 23. 7 f.

is the *servant of God*, as depicted to us by Deutero-Isaiah: how equipped for his work by the Spirit of Jehovah, in humility and silence, destroying nothing, but rather as a saviour, comforting and helping, in untiring patient endurance, and a hope that is strong in faith, amid reproach and persecution, and in faithfulness even unto death, he fulfils his prophetic calling to attest God's truth, and to carry God's salvation even to the ends of the earth; how, himself guiltless, he yet, as the representative of a people devoted to the wrath of God, takes upon himself the guilt of all in love and patient willingness to suffer, bears vicariously their chastisements, yields his life as a guilt-offering for their defections, and thus, by his vicarious punitive suffering, and by his intercession, secures the pardon and salvation of all; how, finally, on this way of suffering and death he passes to unfading glory in the royal dominion appointed for him, and is owned by the whole world — a priestly mediator, to whom all owe salvation. It is deep insight, such as this, that prophecy displays into the saving purpose of God; yet even here knowledge is but in part; for the picture of this servant of God stands beside that other picture of the Divinely-powerful Messianic king without any mediating, unifying link; indeed, the prophet himself does not mean to depict a solitary individual entrusted with the functions of a mediator of salvation, he seeks rather to give, in the ideal personality of the servant of God, a unified and individual representation of the

true congregation of God as the service-staff of Jehovah. Add to which that, in the view of the prophet, the vicarious punitive suffering of the servant coincides, at least in part and in its beginnings, with the sufferings which Jehovah's servants have already endured in the Exile;[1] and the deliverance from the Exile, and the return to the holy land, are the beginning at once of the glorification of the servant of God, and of the salvation mediated through Him to Israel,[2] so that, even here, prophecy remains true to its symbolico-typical character.

(*d*) Bring we, finally, together, in brief compass, the main features of the prophetic view of the *conditions* and *historical course* of the realisation of salvation, omitting, however, what has been already expressly treated. According to the entire testimony of Old Testament prophecy, the Messianic salvation belongs, *in the first instance, to Israel* as the elect people of Jehovah's possession, and is extended to the heathen only through him. Israel can, however, participate in it only upon condition of his *turning in penitence and faith* unreservedly and with his whole heart to his God. Preceding, therefore, the saving redemptive act of God, which effects the consummation of the theocracy, is a *judgment*, and with that act itself a judgment is associated. All the prophets predict this judgment-day of Jehovah, and all agree in representing the

[1] Pp. 214 f.

[2] Even Delitzsch gives repeated and emphatic prominence to the latter point in his exposition of Isa. 40–66; cp. *e.g.* his *Commentary on Isaiah* (Germ.), 3rd ed. p. 514.

judgment as beginning with the people of God. The object of the judgment, as regards Israel, is just to effect this necessary preliminary of penitence and conversion. Frequently it is depicted how the judgment will humble Israel, leading him to perceive and penitently confess his guilt, giving him a distaste of the old ways of sin, and driving him in his extremity to seek his God. In particular, Micah[1]—and, in further exposition of his ideas, Deutero-Isaiah—describe in detail how the people of God, given over to the power of the Gentiles, penitently and willingly endure the judgment as well-deserved, maintaining, however, at the same time, an immovable faith and hope that the faithful covenant-God will lift up His people from their fall, and over against the scorn and mockery poured upon their trust in the God of their salvation, will brilliantly justify them. Along with this, however, it is recognised that the object of the judgment, penitent shame for past defections and thorough conversion, will be fully attained only through the glorious exhibition of the sin-forgiving *redeeming grace of God*. Such is the view even of Hosea,[2] but, in particular, of Ezekiel,[3] who knew from experience how little the refractory spirit of Israel had been broken by the stress of judgment, and therefore frequently emphasises the assertion that God accomplishes His gracious deed of redemption, in spite of Israel's undesert, solely for the honour of His holy name, and for His truth's sake.

[1] Micah 7. 7 ff. [2] Hos. 2. 18 f., 3. 5, 5. 15—6. 3, 14. 1. 8.
[3] Ezek. 20. 33 ff., 16. 63, 36. 31 f.

It is also the view of Deutero-Isaiah, who exhibits the redemptive deed in the same light, and throughout represents the full knowledge of the living God and only Saviour as its object and fruit.—It is a further consequence of the same perception, that both the last-named prophets attest that *only* an impenitent irresponsiveness to the gracious deed of redemption, only *the despising of the Messianic saving grace of God*, carries with it the decisive *judgment of annihilation* that is associated with the work of redemption.[1]—In not a few prophecies, conversion appears as the first-fruit of the outpouring of the Spirit. So, *e.g.*, Zech. 12. 10 ff. This remarkable prophecy determines, at the same time, more precisely the principal object of Israel's penitent mourning: his guilt culminates in the murder of a prophet, and so the penitence expresses itself principally in the mourning of all for one whom they have pierced. A critical exposition of the passage forbids us to see in this prophet the Messias, requiring us rather to regard the murder as having already taken place at the time of the prophecy; still what we have here—though under typical veil—is a definite recognition of the fact, that, while Israel participates in the Messianic salvation, he will have to mourn *the worst result of a deadly enmity cherished by him towards a servant of God* sent in witness of the truth. This recognition also we find, again, in Deutero-Isaiah, in so far at least as his prophecy also represents the suffering of the servant of God as occasioned by the enmity of apostate Israelites,

[1] Ezek. 20. 38, Isa. 48. 22, 50. 11, 57. 20 f., 65. 11 ff., 66. 24.

and in so far as the penitent and pardoned Israelites acknowledge that they have failed to know, and have lightly esteemed, the servant of God, when he took the form of a sufferer, deeming him as one justly chastened of God; but that now they have come to know that he, the guiltless one, bore *their* guilt and punishment.[1] — Finally, prophecy also foretold that, *immediately* preceding the advent of the Divine Judge of His people and Redeemer of His faithful ones, there should come *a great prophet as preparer of the way*, who, by his Divinely-powerful word, should summon the people to repentance.[2]

Upon Israel's conversion and redemption there follows the *entrance of the Gentiles* into the Kingdom of God. This event also, according to the entire testimony of Old Testament prophecy, is prepared for, conditioned, and accompanied by a *judicial* revelation of the holy majesty of Jehovah, in destroying the determined enemies of His kingdom, in filling the spared remnant with fear and trembling before Him, and in opening their eyes to the nothingness of their idols, and to Jehovah's sole Godhead. The judgment which produces such an effect strikes, moreover, in the first instance, the world-power, to whose dominion the people of God had been given over. On the other hand, it is the association of this judgment with the *redemption* of Israel, and the gift to him of the *Messianic salvation*, which awakens in the Gentiles the longing to be attached likewise to the God Whom they have

[1] Isa. 53. [2] Mal. 3. 1, 4. 5 f.

come to know as the only strength and salvation. In some individual prophecies[1] there is ascribed, further, to the person and blessing-laden government of the Divinely-powerful Messianic king, a certain attractive power, which determines the nations to yield willing subjection to him as God's representative on earth, and match his royal requirements with a ready obedience. In others it is announced that *God Himself* will make known His will, and, by the exercise of His unerring judicial power, set up among them His kingdom of peace;[2] that He will take away the veil of their ignorance and blindness,[3] and purify their lips from the defilement of the idol-names, so that they shall call upon His name and serve Him in one mind.[4] Another clear and definite announcement of Old Testament prophecy is, however, that the people of God will be instrumental in bringing to the nations the true knowledge and worship of God, and in executing upon the Gentiles the saving purpose of the Divine mercy. As early as Jeremiah[5] we find the beginnings of this perception, and Deutero-Isaiah depicts repeatedly and in detail, how, with an untiring endurance, ever ready to suffer, and in faithfulness even unto death, the servant of God, appointed a light to the Gentiles, fulfils a prophetic witness-vocation, which God had in view even at the time of Israel's election, until the sworn decree of Jehovah, that every knee should bow, and every tongue swear to Him, shall have been carried out, and the

[1] *E.g.* Zech. 9. 10, Isa. 11. 10.
[2] Isa. 2. 3 f.
[3] Isa. 25. 7.
[4] Zeph. 3. 9.
[5] Jer. 12. 16, 30. 10.

salvation of God shall have reached the ends of the earth.—But prophecy has too clear a perception of the sin and alienation from God that prevail in the world, and of the far-reaching nature of the contrast between the Gentile world-kingdoms and the Kingdom of God, to be able to present the prospect of a development to this goal, that should be peaceful and without conflict or further judgments. Hence it announces repeatedly, as immediately preceding the last time, a final conflict of the heathen world-power with the Kingdom of God, ending in the complete victory of the latter, and a destroying judgment upon the assailants. Such is already the representation of Joel,[1] Micah,[2] and the preëxilian Zechariah.[3] Jeremiah also prophesies that, beyond the first judgment upon the idolatrous nations hostile to Israel, after their pardon and restoration, and after the knowledge of the true God has been offered to them, and the door to His kingdom been opened, yet a second judgment will overtake and destroy those who persist in their obduracy.[4] The destroying judgment thus awaits the Gentiles also, only in so far as, in spite of Jehovah's deeds of judgment and grace, they betray an *unwillingness* to enter the kingdom of God through impenitent persistence in their enmity against God and His kingdom. The most remarkable form of this announcement occurs in Ezekiel: after the first judgment —which secures Israel against the surrounding nations[5]

[1] Joel 3. 9 ff.
[2] Micah 4. 11 ff., 5. 5 f.
[3] Zech. 12. 1 ff., 14. 3 ff., 12 ff.
[4] Jer. 12. 17.
[5] Ezek. 28. 24 ff.

—the Kingdom of God is set up in perfected form for Israel on the soil of the holy land, and the people of God enjoy a *long period* of secure rest and deep peace.[1] Only in the last days the most distant peoples, who have not yet learned the power of Jehovah, assemble in troops round Gog, king of Magog, for a last assault upon the Kingdom of God, whereupon the last judgment of God falls upon them and their countries,—a judgment in which He approves Himself as the Holy One in the eyes of all peoples, in order that all may know Him, and the people of God remain for ever secured against all assaults and reproach.[2] But Deutero-Isaiah also holds out the prospect, after the judgment upon the Chaldean world-power, and after the people of God have begun to fulfil their prophetic witness-vocation, of another and last assault of the heathen peoples upon the city of God, and of a last great judgment upon them, in consequence of which even the most distant peoples will pay homage to Jehovah, of Whose glory they will hear from fugitives.[3]

As Old Testament prophecy knows nothing of a twofold coming of the Messias in the form of a servant and in glory, it necessarily fails to bring clearly to light the mustard-seed growth of the community of the New Covenant, and the difference between the first humble form of the Church militant and the final glorious form of the Church triumphant. Usually it associates rather the erection of the Kingdom of God in its final form immediately with the redemptive act

[1] Ezek. 38. 8. 11 f. [2] Ezek. chaps. 38 and 39. [3] Isa. 66. 18 ff.

of God, which brings about the era of salvation. Nevertheless the fundamental law, which determines the course of the development of the Kingdom of Christ, is clearly expressed in the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah. God's ways are different from the ways of men; His work attains accomplishment in quite another way than human works. His people, whom He has called as His servant to accomplish His saving purposes, attain nothing by external power, by operations that are noisy, violent, or that strike the eye. The power that originates from Him must find its warrant in the victory of His people over an external world-power, to which yet they appear to be subject. Victory is won only through the humble, self-renouncing, pain-defying devotion of God's people to Himself, and to their entrusted vocation of salvation and love, and through the invisible power of God and His truth; only on the way of humiliation and suffering do the people of God come to participate in their destined glory.

Finally, be it once again remembered that even Old Testament prophecy announces, as the closing scene of the entire history of salvation, the resurrection and accompanying final judgment of the dead (this specially in the Book of Daniel), and the renewal and glorifying of heaven and earth.

In all this we recognise the elements of New Testament apprehension of the conditions of receiving salvation, and of the course of development pursued by the history of the Theocracy. In particular, we see also the main lines of New Testament eschatology;

but here also the fragmentary character of the prophetic apprehensions, and the practice of veiling them under types, make themselves in many ways apparent. Thus it is shown that at every point the Messianic prophecy of the Old Covenant fails to present any full apprehension of God's saving purpose as carried out in the New Covenant, and that so far from its doing so, the accomplishment of that purpose is its first full revelation.

5. The actual execution of God's saving purpose in and through Christ goes, according to the foregoing exposition, far beyond the content of Messianic prophecy: it is a more glorious revelation of the eternal love of God, it offers a yet greater salvation than that which prophecy places in prospect; but it is none the less on that account the fulfilment of prophecy. Not even the unreserved acknowledgment of the fragmentary character of the prophetic apprehensions, in consequence of which the carrying out of God's saving purpose appears distributed among various mediating agents of salvation, implies in any degree a dissolution of the bond which unites Old Testament prophecy and New Testament fulfilment. For what is true of Messianic prophecy in general and as a whole, viz. that it *has its God-intended and God-ordained ultimate reference to Christ—giving it its place in historical revelation,* is true even of those Messianic prophecies which, in their historical sense, do not treat of the person of the Messias, but of the visible appearance of Jehovah for final judgment and for redemption, or of the theocratic community of the Old Covenant, or of the Messianic

high priest. The decree of God, fixed before the foundation of the world, that Christ should assume the central position of sole mediator of all salvation in the Kingdom of God and in humanity, implied that all prophecies, proceeding from whatsoever different starting-points, should from the first point towards Him, should converge towards Him as rays of light to their focal point, and find in and through Him their unified fulfilment.[1]

Even before the appearance of Christ we find at least the beginnings of a way of interpreting prophecy which recognises this ultimate reference to the great design of historical revelation, and goes therefore beyond the historical sense of individual predictions. The gulf between the content of Old Testament prophecy and New Testament fulfilment is at least in some degree bridged over by the development of the religious perceptions of Judaism in the post-canonical period. We cannot enter here on a detailed proof of this. The Judaeo-Alexandrian doctrine of the *Logos*, the speculations[2] formulated in the *Shĕkhīnā'* and the

[1] Cp. 2 Cor. 1. 20. Cp. BERTHEAU in *loc. cit.* 1859, p. 320: "Many are the threads of prophecy which, pervading the Old Testament in motley complication, meet in the Mediator of the New Testament." OEHLER, Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, art. "Messias," 1st ed. p. 417; 2nd ed. p. 648: "It belongs to the character of prophecy to present in its envisaging forms *disjecta membra* which are harmoniously blended only in the course of the fulfilling history. The presuppositions of all the essential determinations of New Testament Christology are to be found in the Old Testament, but the revealing word which unites them organically and gives them their ultimate form, is given only along with the accomplished revealing fact."

[2] *Theologoumena.*

Mēmrā' [1] (indwelling, word) [2] of the Palestinian theology, and the conception of the *Hypostatic Wisdom*, notoriously paved the way for the New Testament doctrine of the *Trinity*, and in particular for its doctrine of the *Son;* and besides these we need give prominence in a Christological reference only to an idea which can claim so early a witness as the Book of Enoch (48. 3. 6), that, viz., of the antemundane preexistence of the Messias, which approximates further to the conception found in the Targum of Jonathan, that the Messias was already present, and would emerge from obscurity so soon as Israel repented; [3] and, as regards the opened Heaven of Christian hope, we may refer to the doctrine of immortality of the later Judaism,[4] and especially to the frequent representations—occurring also in the Targum of Jonathan—of eternal life, and of the second death, which the condemned, who are consigned to Gehenna, must die.—The point of importance, however, for us to note in this connexion is that even the oldest Jewish exegesis referred to the Messias many passages which in their historical sense contain no mention of him, and associated the fulfilment of all the promises of salvation with his

[1] Cp. thereon FERD. WEBER, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, Leipzig 1880, pp. 174 ff.

[2] [The technical terms, common in Old Testament post-canonical times, for the *manifested glory* and the *revelation* of Jehovah.—TR.]

[3] Jonath. Micah 4. 8: "And thou Messias of Israel, *who art concealed because of the sins of the community of Zion*, to thee will the kingship come," etc. Cp. besides, WEBER in *loc. cit.* pp. 339 ff.

[4] Cp. *e.g.* Jonath. Isa. 4. 3.—Isa. 22. 14, 65. 6. 15.—Hos. 14. 9, Isa. 26. 15. 19 and other passages.

appearance.[1] In the Targum of Jonathan, which—later additions apart—was certainly written before the destruction of Jersualem, and rests upon a traditional style of exegesis which reaches back into the pre-Christian era, very many prophecies—among them the most of those which are cited by the New Testament writers—are stamped as Messianic. This is specially true of Deutero-Isaiah's prophecies regarding the servant of God. The thought of a suffering and dying Messias is, of course, sedulously excluded, and everything that is said in Isa. 53 of the suffering of the servant of God is set aside by a strained interpretation.[2]

[1] In his treatise, "Ueber doppelten Schriftsinn" (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, Pt. i. Cp. also his *Alttest. Theol.* 2nd ed. pp. 828 ff.), HERM. SCHULTZ has shown how many of the Psalms, specially the monarchical ones, have acquired, through their use in public worship in the Old Testament community, and on the basis of their original historical sense, a second and higher Messianic sense.

[2] Except that in Isa. 53. 12 the clause "because he hath poured out his soul unto death" was allowed to remain. The paraphrast, however, could hardly have intended it to be understood as referring to a literal endurance of death (cp. Weber in *loc. cit.* p. 345). So far, moreover, as individual passages, depicting the sufferings of the servant of God, are referred to the misery of the Israelitish nation, this is less an instance of strained exegesis (such as we find practised with the most violent arbitrariness in 53. 3. 7. 9) than of keeping—though doubtless in a very external way—to the historical sense; it marks simply the fact that the Messianic interpretation is not yet established; the older historical understanding of prophecy still asserts itself over against it to a considerable extent. We take this opportunity of pointing out, further, that in the passage, Sir. 48. 10 f. (which treats of the return of Elias), use is made of Isa. 49. 6 along with Mal. 4. 5, which presupposes a reference or an accompanying reference of the prophecy regarding the servant of God to the prophetic office, or, more exactly, to the *prophétēs pistòs*, *faithful prophet* (1 Macc. 14. 41), expected in accordance with Deut. 18. 15, or, otherwise, the revival of ancient prophecy in the returning Elias.

Such interpretations, however, always rest, along with the designation of the future aeon (*ʿalmā' dhᵉʾāthē = hāʿōlām habbā'*) as the time of the Messias,[1] upon the supposition that the Messias has in general to be viewed as the mediator of the salvation destined for the people of God, and especially of the forgiveness of sin.[2]—Hence it cannot surprise us that, on the basis of such a mode of exegesis, transcending as it does the historical sense of prophecy, and laying hold of its ultimate design in the scheme of historical revelation, Zacharias should regard the prophecy of the coming of the Lord to His people,[3] and Simeon, the promises relating to the servant of God,[4] as finding their fulfilment in the Messias.

Yet all this was but a preparatory initiation of the perception that all the promises of God were to become "yea and amen" in the person of the one Messianic mediator of salvation.[5] For this perception wells forth for the first time with perfect clearness from the Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus Christ. As the Son, who has the full confidence of His Father as regards the latter's mind and intentions, He, in general, so construes the word of Old Testament Scripture as to bring forth the eternal thoughts of God from their temporary national veil. The word of prophecy, in particular, He treats in this way. He understands and interprets it as One conscious of having been appointed sole Mediator of salvation before the foundation of the world, and of having now come to accom-

[1] Jonathan, 1 Kings 4. 33. [2] Cp. Jonathan, Isa. 53. 4.
[3] Luke 1. 76. [4] Luke 2. 31 f. [5] 2 Cor. 1. 20.

plish the whole saving counsel of the Father regarding humanity. In this consciousness He makes Himself the Subject of all the saving mediatorial activities and experiences which prophecy predicated of various subjects, and which were to perfect the Kingdom.—By His confirmatory acceptance of the confession that He is the Christ[1] and of the title "Son of David," by His Self-designation as the "Son of Man" and the "Son of God" (albeit the content of these names is not confined to their Messianic sense), by His sworn confession before the Council,[2] and by His festive Messianic entrance into Jerusalem conformably to the words of the prophecy, Zech. 9. 9, He declares the prophecies of the coming Messias as, above all others, those which are in part fulfilled and in part about to be fulfilled in His own person and work as the King of the heavenly Kingdom. Of course, however, the picture of the Messianic King which emerges from the depths of His self-consciousness is different from that of the prophets; the two pictures are just as distinct from each other as are the Old Testament delineation of an external theocracy and the New Testament idea of the Kingdom of heaven; but, on the other hand, they have the same internal mutual relations as these latter. The Messianic King of the Kingdom of God, through whom God's kingly rule and His judicial and saving work are mediated, has, in Christ's sense, first of all only an invisible spiritual power, founded especially upon the spiritual power of the truth which He came into the

[1] Matt. 16. 16 f. [2] Matt. 26. 63 f.

world to attest and authenticate; His glory, at first mainly ethical, is as yet concealed, recognisable only to the eye of faith; His Kingdom, that is not of this world, is, in the first instance, set up inwardly in the heart; His way to glory and universal recognition leads through the deepest humiliation in His suffering of death; and, even after all power has been given Him in heaven and on earth, His kingly government, by means of which He leads His people to meet the End on the same road that He has gone Himself, is manifest first of all only to the faith that looks into the invisible world, until at the end of days He will return in full revelation of His kingly glory to judge His enemies and set up His Kingdom in its perfect form.—We may say that the difference between this picture of the Messianic king and that indicated by the prophets results mainly from the unification and organic combination of the idea of the Messias and the idea of the servant of God, effected in the self-consciousness of Christ, and that it is only in the announcements of the second coming of Christ in His glory that the features of the prophetic picture of the Messias emerge in their full brilliance.

Christ relates also to Himself in the same way what is prophesied of the servant of God, *i.e.* the theocratic community of the Old Covenant, who were in Jehovah's service. His explanation of Isa. 61. 1 f. in the synagogue at Nazareth: "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears,"[1] already implies this; and of the saying

[1] Luke 4. 21.

in Isa. 53. 12, He says expressly that it must be fulfilled in Himself.[1] But even in the vaguer references to Old Testament prophecy regarding His sufferings and death, and the glory that should follow,[2] He has without doubt, besides Ps. 22, the prophecy regarding the servant of God in Isa. 53 chiefly in view. He is, consciously to Himself, the personal Mediator of salvation, Who has come forth from Israel and is a member of that nation, in Whom the theocratic community of the Old Covenant fulfils the prophetic and priestly calling entrusted to it, and in Whom, therefore, all the Divine thoughts of the substitutionary sufferings of the servant of God and their fruit and reward necessarily find their fullest realisation. In Him, as Centre of the theocratic community of the Old Covenant, its God-ordained Head and mediatorial Representative, the Bearer of its prophetic and priestly office for humanity, the prophecy regarding the servant of God attains the goal Divinely intended in the scheme of historical revelation. Thus the ideal collective personality becomes in the fulfilment an individual Person, in Whom what was said of the former must now be fulfilled. Hence it is with good ground that the apostles also find all the predictions of the prophetic ministry[3] and the vicarious death[4] of the servant of God fulfilled in Christ.

But Christ also regards the prophecy of the visible

[1] Luke 22. 37.
[2] Mark 9. 12, Matt. 26. 54, Luke 24. 25 ff. 44 ff.
[3] Matt. 12. 17 ff. [4] Acts 8. 32 ff., 1 Pet. 2. 22 ff.

appearance of Jehovah in the angel of the covenant for judgment and redemption as fulfilled in His person. This appears without ambiguity in His express declaration that His own forerunner, John the Baptist, was the Elias who, according to prophecy, should prepare the way for the coming Jehovah.[1] When, in the light of the fact that the highest expression of hostility to the truth of God that converted Israel has penitently to bewail consists in the crucifixion of the Messias, who is at the same time the greatest of the God-sent prophets, the prophecy in Zech. 12. 10 ff. also is stripped of its typical veil and referred to Christ,[2] and when we say that He is not only the Messianic King but also the Messianic High Priest whom Zechariah's prophecy had placed beside the former, we may see in such procedure simply a further application and carrying out of Christ's own apprehension of prophecy. Similarly, all the New Testament indications of the fulfilment in Christ of such Scriptures as those in which we can recognise Messianic prophecies only because of their essentially typical structure, are but a further carrying out of the understanding of prophecy offered by Christ Himself. *They* also find footing in the certainty that, according to the eternal counsel of God, Christ is the accomplisher of the whole saving

[1] Matt. 11. 10–14, 17. 10 ff. This important feature in the Self-testimony of the Synoptical Christ, which, not less than the much-discussed passage, Matt. 11. 27, has points of connexion with the Self-testimony of the Johannine Christ, has not yet been properly attended to.

[2] John 19. 37, Rev. 1. 7.

purpose of God, and that therefore also the prophetic substance of all those Scriptures which express God's eternal thoughts of salvation in application to definite historical or specifically Old Testament circumstances (express them, therefore, in typical veil), finds its God-intended goal of ultimate reference in Christ as the end of historical revelation,—a reference which, of course, frequently became apparent to the apostles themselves only after the event, as, indeed, is several times expressly remarked,[1] and which they for the most part, discarding the historical sense, keep exclusively in view.[2] Hence also the plan they usually

[1] John 20. 9, 2. 22.

[2] A more detailed exposition of the subject of the New Testament citations of Old Testament prophecies lies beyond the domain of our task. We add here, in brief appendix, only some general remarks. The New Testament writers, as also Christ Himself, throughout regard the word of Old Testament Scripture solely from the point of view of an interest in such apprehension of saving truth as is of immediate importance to the life that proceeds from God and is in Him. It does not therefore at all occur to them to ask how the prophets themselves understood their own predictions, or how they were necessarily understood by their contemporaries. Their sole concern is with what the Spirit of God attests in them for themselves, for *their* contemporaries, and for all times, *i.e.* with the eternal Divine substance of the word of Old Testament Scripture; and they therefore regard this substance entirely in the light of New Testament knowledge given in Christ. Thus, in particular, their understanding of prophecy is throughout conditioned and determined by its fulfilment. This by no means implies that their exegesis is arbitrary. It is only here and there that there occur individual instances of interpretations and Scripture-proofs, whose validity and cogency we must altogether disallow, and these are just the cases in which the New Testament writers employ the modes of exegesis prevalent among their Jewish contemporaries—particularly the Alexandrian method of allegorising—with the view of offering a more learned and scholarly style of Scripture-proof (Gal. 3. 16, 4. 21 ff.; also some of the *minutiae* of Heb. 7). Apart from these exceptions,

adopt in the citation of such passages of not naming the human authors as those who have uttered the particular saying, but of using such formulas of citation as: "It is written," "The Scripture saith," "God hath spoken," "The Holy Ghost witnesseth," etc., has a reasonable ground of justification, for the sense in which they apprehend such texts is precisely not their historical sense, but is one rather that corresponds with the ultimate reference of the prophecies to Christ as the end of historical revelation, a reference that is intended by God or the Spirit of God.

We may add to the above a brief reference to a

their usual style of exegesis does not consist in an allegorising introduction of alien matter into the text of Scripture, but in a deeply thoughtful, Divinely-inspired exhibition of the inmost kernel, the ideal, eternal substance which, though concealed in a times-adapted veil, it really contains. They do indeed find in the text of Scripture a meaning far transcending that which is discoverable by a strictly historical mode of exposition, and they regard this meaning as the true one, the one that is intended by the Spirit of God; but this meaning is not introduced arbitrarily; it stands in inner connexion with the historical meaning; and the apostles did but follow an inner necessity, did but act in conformity with an objective law, of which, of course, they were not themselves as a rule clearly conscious, when, in the light of the New Covenant, they understood Scripture texts in this higher sense. The inner connexion of their interpretation, given from the standpoint of fulfilment, with the historical sense of the passages cited, is supplied, on the one hand, by the ideal substance which, whether compressed into Old Testament and times-adapted forms or applied to definite circumstances, is really present in the words of Scripture; and, on the other, by the Divine teleology, dominating and informing the history of salvation, in accordance with which the character of a pretype of the New Covenant belongs to the entire Old Covenant, inasmuch as all the Divine thoughts, while attaining *essential* realisation in Christ, are realised only temporarily and imperfectly in the Old Covenant. It was Christianity that first brought to light the essential features of this *typological*, as distinguished from the *allegorical*, mode of exegesis. While historical exegesis ascertains the sense that the

difficulty that might possibly be occasioned by our assertion that the unifying and organic comprehension of the fragmentary glimpses of truth offered in the Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament was accomplished only through its fulfilment in Christ. It might be said, in that case the end of prophecy could have been attained only very imperfectly as regards the measure of insight available for the contemporaries of Jesus. In particular, the offence at Christ's servant-form and the death on the cross was very excusable if Old Testament prophecy did not really know of a suffering and dying Messias, and if the prophetic pic-

text of Scripture had for the authors and their contemporaries, this typological exposition exhibits the significance which it acquires in the light of the whole history of salvation as attaining its goal in Christ; it ascertains its ultimate point of reference, as decreed in the counsel of God, which was hidden, but became manifest when the time was fulfilled; and, whether to the consciousness of the expositor himself or not, it has always as its substratum the historical sense, inasmuch as it does not, like the allegorising method, start from some external and casual point in the Scripture text, but grows from an insight into its innermost kernel.—Regarded as a whole, the Hermeneutic of the New Testament is just such a sound, objectively legitimate, typological mode of exegesis. The Old Testament economy constituted still the normal and immediate intellectual horizon and sphere of experience of the New Testament writers; they were at home in the inmost sanctuary of the Old Covenant. Hence they had also a steady and clear eye for the eternal Divine thoughts which compose the kernel of the text of Old Testament Scripture. Their use of Scripture, moreover, was simple, devoid of exegetical art. They confine themselves, as a rule, to the employment of individual passages as Scripture-proofs—passages, however, whose eternal truth-substance attested itself *of itself* to their Christian consciousness, and in which prophetic testimonies of the New Testament salvation came, wholly unbidden, to view. Hence it would not have been easy for them to refer, in a wholly arbitrary way, just what texts they pleased to Christ and His Kingdom. For a more detailed treatment of this subject, cp. THOLUCK's work, *Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testamente.*

ture of the Messias corresponded so little with that of the Son of Man. For a *first* answer to this objection, be it yet again remembered that, at the time of Christ's appearance, the perception that even the prophecy regarding the servant of God pointed ultimately to the one Messianic mediator of salvation, had attained at least its initial stage. But, *specially*, it has to be insisted that the recognition and acknowledgment of Jesus as the Christ could not have rested, and ought not to have rested, on the perception of an external coincidence of prophecy and fulfilment. They were necessarily associated with *ethical* conditions and prerequisites. It was not the fragmentary character of Messianic prophecy and the one-sidedness of the prophetic picture of the Messias, but the absence of these ethical prerequisites, in particular their carnal disposition, which clung to what was earthly and external, and their self-righteousness, which hindered the Jews and their leaders from recognising the promised Messias in the Son of Man, and made His servant-form and His suffering of death to them an occasion of offence and resentment. Wherever, on the other hand, those ethical prerequisites were present, prophecy could fulfil its end in spite of its fragmentary character. He who was content to learn in humility from the prophecy concerning the servant of God who passed to glory through the suffering of death, how and by what means the Theocratic community should fulfil their calling to accomplish the saving purpose of God, and on what road they should reach victory and their

destined glory,—such an one was already prepared for the event which brought before him in Jesus the promised Messias, not, first of all, in the kingly glory of the prophetic picture of the Messias, but in the obscurity and lowliness of the servant of God. Hence, to those who in the right frame of mind waited for the Kingdom of God and the redemption of Israel, neither the servant-form of Christ nor His suffering of death offered any hindrance to their recognising in Him the promised Saviour, for indeed the word of prophecy gave them just the light they needed on these points, and helped to remove the offence which the death on the cross had occasioned to them also.—The whole character, moreover, of Messianic prophecy is opposed to the possibility of an apprehension of its fulfilment in Christ originating in the perception of an external agreement between prophecy and event obvious to the eye of flesh. For, as we have seen, Messianic prophecy is not what the older supernaturalism imagined, essentially prediction of the individual concrete events of the New Testament record of fulfilment, but announcement—announcement in great measure in typical veil—of the eternal saving thoughts of God which were to be accomplished in the New Covenant. Its ideal substance, therefore, is the bond which unites prophecy to its fulfilment; and only he who was able to grasp this ideal substance—these Divine thoughts of salvation—as what was essential in an apprehension which did not cling to the surface or to the letter, but penetrated to the depths of the written word,—an apprehension

surely always ethically conditioned,—was in a position also to recognise the *that* and the *how* of the fulfilment of prophecy in and through Christ.

6. Still we must not fail to give here some special prominence to the fact that, even as regards the concrete historical realisation of the saving thoughts of God, and in relation to a considerable number of particulars here and there, there was exhibited a remarkable coincidence between prophecy and fulfilment. We do not mean that where this is the case the character of Messianic prophecy is so altered as to be less in need of psychological media or less subject to historical conditions, nor do we suppose the Spirit to have in some exceptional way concretely envisaged to the prophets certain individual historical facts of the New Testament fulfilment, — the general rule being that such envisaging is possible only in the case of events which lay actually within their times-horizon ;[1]—what we do mean is that such instances of special coincidence do not occur apart from deep ideal reasons. In particular, they arise from the fact that the same principle of Divine government—prevailing alike in the world and in the Kingdom of God—which reveals itself in the history of Israel at the time of the origin of a prophecy, and hence also assumes such prominence in the consciousness of the prophet as to inform the content of his prophecy and give it its peculiar stamp, has a similar determining effect upon the course and form of the fulfilling history of the New Testament.

[1] Pp. 142 ff.

The circumstance, however, that in several instances the coincidence—thus originated—between prophecy and fulfilment is of so special a nature as to include even particular external incidents, can hardly, we judge, be considered by a living faith in God otherwise than as Divinely-intended,—as, so to speak, sublimated into the plan in accordance with which God has associated together and set in reciprocal relation the *revelation* and the *history* of salvation. Such coincidences are designed as finger-posts, pointing to the deeper and more essential connexion between prophecy and fulfilment—as external holdfasts, aiding a still weak understanding, and attracting attention to the fulfilment of prophecy in such a way as to encourage a more penetrating investigation into the nature of the bond that unites these two correlates of historical revelation.—Such was obviously the design of Christ in arranging His Messianic processional entry into Jerusalem, in literal conformity to the words of Zech. 9. 9. Take for another instance of coincidence Micah's prophecy,[1] that the Messias will proceed from Bethlehem,—a prediction in which the special concern of the prophet is to insist that, after the Divine judgment has plunged it into the lowest depths of degradation, the kingship of the Davidic house will rise, in the person of the Messianic king, a second David, from its deep humiliation to the highest elevation of power and glory, starting, in like manner, a second time from the small inconspicuous Bethlehem;

[1] Micah 5. 2.

and yet a prediction which, if the historicity of the record upon the point can be otherwise established,[1] was fulfilled not only in its ideal substance but also literally.—Quite unassailable, however, by historical criticism is the remarkable coincidence of the New Testament record of fulfilment with the prophecy in Isa. 9. 1 f.,[2] according to which the light of the Messianic salvation was to shed its rays first upon the inhabitants of the tribal districts of Zebulon and Naphtali, the region by the Sea of Gennesaret, and the Jordan.—An equally remarkable agreement, affecting even details, between the record of New Testament fulfilment and the words of Old Testament Scripture is to be found, moreover, in relation to several points which can be regarded as prophecies referring to Christ only, in virtue of their typical significance.[3] The most striking instance of this is the twenty-second Psalm, which presents to every Christian eye an unmistakable picture of the crucified Christ surrounded by His triumphant foes.[4] The agreement also of the picture of the servant of God, as delineated in prophecy, with the picture of Christ extends to several quite minute points.[5] — The New Testament writers acted thus in conformity with the relation actually obtaining

[1] For arguments establishing the historicity of the tradition of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, see B. Weiss' *Das Leben Jesu*, i. pp. 236 ff.

[2] Cp. R.V. [Tr.] with Matt. 4. 13 ff., and, *in re*, Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, ii. pp. 88 f.

[3] Cp. Oehler, art. "Weissagung," p. 656.

[4] Cp. Matt. 27. 43. 46, John 19. 24, with Ps. 22. vv. 8, 1 and 18 resp.

[5] Isa. 42. 2 f., 50. 5 ff., 52. 14 f., and chap. 53.

between prophecy and fulfilment when they found the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy in many cases, even in the *minutiae* of the evangelic narrative, albeit that undoubtedly, in the plenitude of their conviction that the entire Old Testament prophesied of Christ, they gave to the perception of coincidence between prophecy and fulfilment a somewhat wider range than can be conceded to it from the point of view of a correct historical exposition of the words of Old Testament Scripture.—Of a somewhat different kind is the agreement of the concrete historical realisation of the saving thoughts of God with the content of prophecy, which results necessarily from the organico-historic connexion subsisting between the Old and the New Covenant. To this class we reckon, in particular, the Israelitish and Davidic descent of Christ, and the circumstances that the Holy Land constituted the sphere of His ministry, the Holy City the principal scene of the events accomplishing salvation, and an elect from Israel the nucleus of the Christian Church.

7. Through Christ the Messianic prophecy of the Old Covenant fulfils itself further *in His community and in His Kingdom.* This fulfilment, moreover, concerns not merely its announcement regarding the benefits of salvation which are to accrue to the people of God, and, in general, regarding the perfect condition of the people and kingdom of God, but also what it says of the destination and calling of the people of God, and the important consequences which

flow from their realisation. For the prophecy regarding the servant of God did not by any means find a fulfilment adequate to its entire content even in the prophetic ministry, sufferings, death, and glorification of Christ. Inasmuch as it does not, in its historical sense, treat of one personal mediator of salvation, but of the theocratic community of the Old Covenant, its ultimate reference in the scheme of historical revelation is not exclusively to Christ, but also to His Church; and the eternal thoughts of God, which it contains, must find fulfilment, as in Christ, so also in it. As the human organ, used by Christ to execute God's purpose of grace towards humanity, the Church learns from prophecy[1] her destination and calling to carry the salvation of God to the ends of the earth, as is illustrated by the conduct of Paul and Barnabas[2] in certifying their commission to preach salvation in Christ to the Gentiles by an appeal to Isa. 49. 6,—thus interpreting prophecy in the light of the New Covenant in a way not less justifiable than the mode of referring its utterances to the Messias. In prophecy the Church may read her instructions as to how to perform the work of the Lord; not by the employment of external power; not by a clamorous, violent, ostentatious activity, but by conserving in the service of love and truth her God-rooted strength over against the power of a world to which externally she is subject, in enduring patience and self-denying, all-

[1] [*I.e.* specially the prophecy concerning the *Servant of God.*—Tr.]
[2] Acts 13. 46 f.

sacrificing devotion to the Lord and the vocation accepted from Him. It is in prophecy that the Church's progress through suffering and conflict to victory and glory is typically depicted, and even what is said of the vicarious and mediatorial significance of the sufferings of the servant of God—albeit that its full sense was realised only in Christ—has yet, to a certain extent, applicability also to the sufferings of Christians for righteousness and the gospel's sake.[1]

As Messianic prophecy points ultimately to the end of the ways of God and the perfected form of His Kingdom upon earth, the New Testament people of God must still await its complete fulfilment through Christ. Christ Himself has yet to be manifested, as the Messianic King, in His glory; His community has yet to become in full measure what the word of prophecy declares regarding the final condition of the people of God, and His Kingdom has yet to be extended over the whole earth and all peoples. The entire historical development of the Church of Jesus Christ is a continuous fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, a fulfilment that grows gradually but constantly towards completeness; indeed, precisely that to which from the first Old Testament prophecy gives a quite peculiar prominence, and which, usually, it associates immediately with Jehovah's Messianic deed of redemption,—the erection, viz., of the kingdom of God upon earth in a form fully adequate, even in external respects, to its glory,—is in New Testament

[1] Cp. Col. 1. 24, Eph. 3. 13.

fulfilment set at the end. In this reference we might say that the history of fulfilment strikes out an essentially opposite path to that actually traversed by the development of Messianic prophecy. While the latter, on the whole, advances from the conception of the external glory of the perfected Kingdom to the deeper perception of its inner essence and character, and the preliminary conditions of its establishment, in the former the Kingdom of God is founded first inwardly in the heart, then comes its inner growth, and it is only in the end that the inner glory of the Church of God attains external and visible presentation.[1]—But even the prophecies of the final conflicts of the world-empires with the Kingdom of God and of God's final judgments upon His enemies are reassumed by New Testament prophecy as oracles pointing to the final stage of historical development. This is a matter of course with such eschatological announcements as those regarding the resurrection of the dead, the new heaven and new earth, etc. Thus, even the Christian community has still to await the complete fulfilment of the prophecies of the Old Covenant. As we have seen, however, we must beware of considering *all* the unfulfilled features of prophecy—even those which are not reassumed in New Testament prophecy—as predictions still awaiting actual fulfilment.—Similarly, as against a misleading path, a warning must be uttered against seeking in prophecy for definite preannouncements to

[1] Cp. Auberlen, *Abhandl.* p. 790.

solve, as on the authority of the word of God, individual problems that may emerge in the course of the Church's development. Neither Old nor New Testament prophecy offers help of this kind; on the contrary, the only method used by prophecy to shed light upon the course of theocratic development that lies beyond the period which it can claim as its own, is to reveal the fundamental principles and the ultimate aim of the Kingdom of God. If prophecy is not to become a deceptive light, if it is to be conserved as a "sure word of prophecy," to which we "do well" to give heed "as unto a light that shineth in a dark place,"[1] we must use it aright, so use it, *i.e.*, as the prophets themselves used the prophecies of their predecessors. And, as we have seen, they used them, not by way of discovering from them the hidden issues of particular events of their own time or the immediate future, but by way of extracting from them the fundamental thoughts and laws of the Divine government of the world and the fundamental features of God's sovereign plan, and of applying these to the circumstances of their own time. By such a use of prophecy they came, so to speak, to see the trend of actual events.[2] If we follow the precedent they have set us, the Divine word of prophecy will yield us the service it is intended to yield; we have in it "a sure standard of judgment,"[3] applicable to the conditions, efforts, and movements of our own time, and

[1] 2 Pet. 1. 19. [2] *Dadurch wurden sie über diese orientiert.*
[3] Cp. Bertheau (1859), pp. 331 f.

are not in danger of being carried headlong by the prevailing currents of the time, or of becoming the victims of false hopes or groundless fears. We learn more and more to regard contemporary history in that higher light in which it also appears as part of the road that conducts to the final goal of the ways of God.—As to particular periods of Theocratic development yet to come in the hidden counsel of God,—about which so many expositors of the Apocalypse pretend to know,—we know and need know nothing. Enough surely that in watchfulness, readiness, and joyous hope we look stedfastly towards that final goal, regarding the history of our own time as part of the road thither. Not even the prophets themselves in their own time knew more.

A review of our entire argument is surely fitted to yield the conviction that we lose nothing by a strict adherence to the historical mode of expounding Old Testament prophecy, and that, in particular, the beliefs, that salvation through Christ was preannounced by the Divine prophetic word throughout a series of centuries, and that all the promises of God are "yea and amen" in Christ, remain unshaken. We were not at all able to ascribe to the prophets any such great measure of knowledge of the saving purpose of God, or to acknowledge any such great number of individual prophecies as definitely referring to Christ, as those

are wont to do who continue to look at prophecy from the standpoint of a one-sided supernaturalism, or are, at any rate, still influenced by the after-effects of this tendency. Yet the Divine purpose, which so ordered historical revelation that all Old Testament prophecy should point ultimately to Christ, has stood our tests also. But, it may be asked, does our somewhat roundabout procedure—starting, as it does, from an exact definition of the historical sense of prophecy—yield any positive or more than merely theoretic gain?

Do not those come by a much shorter road to the same goal who say, with HENGSTENBERG and KEIL[1]: The question, what thoughts the prophets had, as the result of inquiry regarding the oracles they were inspired by the Spirit of Christ to utter, is not of any special importance; our only business is to look in the light of New Testament fulfilment to what the Spirit of Christ has announced and revealed to us in the utterances of the prophets? May we not, moreover, appeal to the example of Christ and the apostles, who also did not investigate the historical sense of the words of Old Testament Scripture, but looked only to what the Old Testament was found to say when considered in the light of the New? Our first answer is: Our relation to the Old Testament is somewhat different from that of Christ and His apostles, in so far as we have not an acquaintance

[1] HENGSTENBERG, *Christologie*, iii. 2, p. 204. KEIL, *Kommentar zu Hesekiel*, p. 521, note.

with the Old Testament economy, based, as theirs was, upon immediate intuition and experience, and, in particular, we should incur the charge of a blinded self-exaltation, if we were to credit ourselves with the same deep insight which enabled the Lord Himself to grasp and to exhibit with distinctness and certainty the eternal thoughts of God contained in the words of Old Testament Scripture. True, our principal concern also in the practical use of the Old Testament is with what the word of prophecy says to us, and we have therefore to understand and expound it in the light of the New Covenant; this, however, we cannot do with clearness and certainty, if we have not first ascertained its historical sense. Failure in the latter respect leads exegesis astray. Surely the history of Old Testament exegesis in the Christian Church testifies only too loudly to the extent to which, in consequence of the neglect of the historical sense of prophecy, genuine typological exposition degenerated into an uncertain and arbitrary, an allegorising and dogmatising Hermeneutic, introducing everywhere—even in the wrong place — references to Christ and properly New Testament apprehensions, and often enough thereby overlooking the Divine thoughts actually contained in the word of Scripture, so dissipating its inherent force.[1] There is no security from the risk of falling into the errors of this Hermeneutic apart from a clear

[1] Cp. my lecture, *Ueber die besondere Bedeutung des Alten Testamentes für die religiöse Erkenntniss und das religiöse Leben der christlichen Gemeinde* (Halle 1864), pp. 23 ff.

insight into the historical character of prophecy, and the relation of its historical sense to New Testament fulfilment. Similarly, it is this insight alone which can save us from that Judaising over-estimation of the specifically Old Testament envisaging forms contained in prophecy which, in a practical regard, is by no means inconsiderable, as it not only, in particular, influences hurtfully the mission to the Jews, but has also—as shown by certain sectarian movements in our own time — proved itself capable of leading to fantastic errors in other directions.

Furthermore, we consider ourselves warranted in asserting with confidence that our plan of doing full justice to the historical sense of Messianic prophecy brings the gain of a more complete apprehension of the Divine revelation, preparatory to Christ and His Kingdom, which it contains, as well in its historical reality as in its true character and wonderful glory—a glory worthy of the Divine educative wisdom. For the reader, who, in unconcern for the historical sense, imports into the utterances of prophecy apprehensions which came to light only with the New Testament fulfilment, these utterances neither disclose their full living substance, nor is there any accompanying feeling that he stands on secure historical ground; such a reader, indeed, renounces from the first a clear, historically-grounded apprehension of the wonderful contrivances which the educative wisdom of God employed to train Israel for the New Covenant. The more, on the other hand, we learn to understand the

individual prophecies in their organico-genetic connection with the religious life of the Old Testament covenant-people, and in their relativity to the concrete historical circumstances of the time of their origin, the more do they give us the impression of the fresh forceful vitality peculiar to what is historically actual. And when we come, further, to see how these individual prophecies, starting as they do from different points, each one announcing fragmentarily only individual *momenta* of the saving purpose of God, and all keeping more or less within the limits of Old Testament apprehension, yet find in Christ their unified fulfilment, transcending all previous conception, there emerge to view in more tangible historic reality the governing-policy (das Walten) of the spirit of revelation in the prophets, and the educative work of Jehovah preparatory to Christ, and we gain also, provided we still retain some sense of "the joy in the green germ-thoughts and the original wealth of ideas of Holy Scripture in its festive spring-attire,"[1] a deeper insight into the adorable glory of this educative work. For it is not the man who sees a landscape only when everything is green, but rather he who has been able to watch the sprouting, budding, and gradual blooming, whom the beauty of spring impresses most deeply with the sense of the glory of God as revealed in nature; even so, he does not gain the deepest insight into Divine revelation, who thinks to find

[1] Words of LÜCKE in his preface to the 2nd ed. of DE WETTE'S *Komment. zur Offenb. Joh.* p. 13. See Appendix A, Note VIII.

saving truth everywhere in Holy Scripture in its fully-developed New Testament form, but rather he who has an open eye also for its gradual coming to the light in the spirit of the Theocratic heroes of the Old Covenant.

APPENDICES.

—o—

A.—NOTES.

I. P. 21. Sentence indicated by note 1. It is only fair to give the German of this difficult sentence: "Die äusseren Sinne ruhten dabei ganz; das verständige Bewusstsein (der *noûs*) war vom *pneûma* überwältigt, und zwar so, dass es allerdings nicht pausierte, vielmehr erhöht und armiert wurde und der intellektuellen Anschauung, soweit es möglich ist, in ihrem Fluge zu folgen suchte, aber doch hinter ihr in bescheidener Entfernung zurückbleiben musste, sich zur Höhe der unmittelbaren Erkenntnisse nicht zu erheben vermochte, überhaupt nur in einem untergeordneten, dienenden Verhältnisse zu dem Vermögen der inneren Wahrnehmung stand" (Germ. p. 16). The motive and difficulty of the view of inspiration here indicated are fully set forth by Riehm (see esp. p. 23, note). Hengstenberg would safeguard the reality of inspired certainty by inventing for it a special faculty—the "intellektuelle Anschauung" or "innere Wahrnehmung." The above sentence describes his attempt to explain the relation of this faculty to the ordinary thinking powers. Manifestly, however, Hengstenberg only gets rid of one difficulty to become involved in another. He is deceived by his own metaphor of the *dienendes Verhältniss*. Is it at all easier to conceive of God as acting upon the human spirit through the medium of a process *within* the mind, *in which the mind itself* (as rational self-consciousness)

does not participate, than to conceive of Him as acting upon it *directly*, and in such a way that the mind, while acknowledging its debt to revelation and correlative *inspiration*, yet claims the new truth, once it has grasped it, as wholly its own? The latter is Riehm's view. He does not philosophise upon it, nor claim for it freedom from all difficulty. What difficulty there is in it is God's affair, not ours. Faith leaves the difficulty with Him, assured that He is able to deal with it without any breach of the laws He has Himself imposed upon the mind of man. See *in re* Riehm, p. 45, note 2.

II. P. 32, note 1. "Während er in den prophetischen Schriften die 'Zuthaten' und 'Ausschmückungen' als zwar nicht 'direkt göttlichen,' aber doch als 'gottmenschlichen Inhalt' anerkennt (ii. p. 357), will er die historischen Bücher des Alten Testamentes im einzelnen und so auch in ihren Aussagen über die Propheten darauf angesehen und nach der Norm des prophetischen Selbstzeugnisses beurteilt wissen, 'ob sich dem göttlichen Korn menschliche Spreu in der Tradition beigemischt hat'" (ii. p. 318). It is uncertain whether the "prophetic self-testimony" is not to be taken in the more restricted sense of the *testimony of the prophets regarding themselves*. The note is to be interpreted in the light of the sentence in p. 31, "Still König," etc. *Tests applied to* is literally—and perhaps ought to have been rendered—*norm of*.

III. P. 33. *But to require*, etc. The reference is, of course, to the idea of *accommodation*. Riehm objects to a use of a sober and legitimate hypothesis, which reduces it to what he calls an "abenteuerliche Karikatur." The next sentence, perhaps, hardly expresses the original. It should be read with an emphasis on the word *him* ("necessarily led him"). König's "candour" is commendable, in so far as it led him to acknowledge the historical limitations of prophecy. But this critical candour, when exhibited by one who believes that God

accommodates Himself primarily to the *sense*-faculties, leads to very extraordinary results (cp. esp. p. 30, note).

IV. P. 66, note 1. *Book of the Four Covenants* (Vierbundesbuch), so called from the four covenants (Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses), includes Ex. 25–40 (except 32–34), nearly the whole of Leviticus, Num. 1–10, 15–19, 25–36, with a certain thin thread of narrative pervading the whole Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. Ewald calls it the *Book of Origins*. Its first name was the *Elohistic* Document (from the constant use of *'Ĕlohim* as the Divine name), and up till recently it was generally known by the name *Grundschrift* ("main stock"), an appellation founded upon the belief that it was the earliest document of the Hebrew Bible, and therefore in some sense the substratum of the whole. Since the publication of Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*, 1878 (Eng. transl., A. & C. Black), the so-called "Grafian Hypothesis," according to which the *Grundschrift* is not the earliest, but the latest of the documents of the Hexateuch (*i.e.* the Pentateuch and Joshua) has become popular among scholars. The *Grundschrift* appears now as the *Priestly Code*, and is regarded as directly authoritative only as testifying to the requirements of the religious standpoint prevalent in the time of Ezra. It will be observed that, while Riehm does not commit himself to the new view (the sentence to which we here refer rather assumes the correctness of the old view), he is careful to base no argument upon what would be inconsistent with either the one or the other (see esp. p. 65, note 2). On the whole subject, cp. Wellh. *Prol.*, Eng. transl. pp. 6 ff., 17–293, 376 ff., 392 ff.; and, for a clear and simple statement, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, W. R. Smith: A. & C. Black, Edinburgh 1881, pp. 208 ff.

V. P. 80. *But the attainment of which*, etc. The rendering is, perhaps, rather free. The German is: "Welches (Ziel) zu erreichen aber sein göttlicher Beruf

und seine Bestimung sei, und zu dem es auch am Ende kraft des göttlichen Erwählungsratschlusses gewiss gelangen werde" = *To attain which goal was, however, his Divine calling and his destination, and which goal he would certainly in the end reach, in virtue of the Divine elective decree.*

VI. P. 149. *And if his hope*, etc. Sentence marked by note 3; Germ. pp. 110–111: "Wie sollte er also, wenn ihm seine Hoffnung das letztere als ein nahes vergegenwärtigt, bei der Schilderung desselben nicht auch in seine Gegenwart hineingreifen." There seems to be a half-conscious resonance between the words *vergegenwärtigt* and *Gegenwart* which I have tried to reproduce. The sentence is awkwardly constructed, and it may fairly be doubted whether the *sein* in *seine Gegenwart* relates to the *Endziel* or to the prophet himself—probably to the latter, though, in that case, the *auch* seems peculiar. The translation seems to favour the reference to the former, and I have allowed the sentence to remain as I wrote it first, because it seems to bring out the resonance above noted, without in the least degree altering the author's meaning, more effectively than a sentence altered to suit the strictly correct reference of the possessive pronoun could have done.

VII. P. 201, note 2. The German of the italicised words is: "Dass Jehova selbst kommen werde, um seinen Einzug im Tempel zu halten und diesen für ewig zur Stätte seiner Wohnung zu machen." The preposition *im* (before *Tempel*) seems to refer both to the verb *halten* and the noun *Einzug*, though the latter reference involves, of course, a slight grammatical inaccuracy.

VIII. P. 322, note. The sentence from which these words are taken may here be quoted in full, as an interesting statement of the view of the function of

Scripture which Riehm himself favours (I italicise the words which Riehm quotes): "Wenn man jetzt wieder darauf ausgeht, in der Exegese alle theologischen Instrumente und Stimmen gleichsam zu einem theologischen Universalconcert zu vereinigen, als wäre die Exegese die ganze Theologie, da sie doch nur ihre Wurzel oder ihr Grundbau ist, oder wenn man wieder Lust zeigt und darnach strebt an die Stelle der freien wissenschaftlichen Auslegung in ihrer Gebundenheit durch das gemeinsame Princip der evangelischen Kirche die confessionell beschränkte kirchliche, und an die Stelle der wissenschaftlichen hermeneutischen Norm die Norm der symbolisch gewordenen dogmatischen Formel zu setzen, wenn man endlich sich gar nicht mehr verstehen will *auf die Freude an den grünen Keimgedanken und an der ursprünglichen Ideenfülle der heiligen Schrift in ihrem Frühlingsschmucke,* sondern nur darauf aus ist, die Schrift zu einer Scheuer voll eingesammelter und ausgedroschener Aehren dogmatischer Begriffe von sonst und jetzt herabzusetzen,—so würde de Wette mit allen geistig lebendigen und frischen Theologen gegen dergleichen scholastische Barbareien welche, wie die Geschichte lehrt, nur zu Entkräftigungen, Abschwächungen und Verwahrlosungen des ursprünglichen Gottes- u. Herrnwortes in der Schrift führen, den entschiedensten Protest eingelegt haben, wie er es auch schon gethan hat in Beziehung auf die Anfänge und Vorboten solcher Verirrungen."

B.—INDEX TO SCRIPTURE PASSAGES CITED BY RIEHM.

(Nos. to the right show the pages where references occur; *c.* and *cs.* = *chapter*, *chapters*; *ps.* = *psalm.*)

GENESIS.

	PAGE
2. 10 ff.,	99
3. 20,	93
9. 26,	69
10. 10,	147
12. 2 f.,	68, 97, 193
13. 14 ff.,	68
17. 6,	106
17. 7 f.,	68, 83
18. 18, 18. 18 f.,	97, 193, 68
18. 25,	91
21. 17,	31
22. 15,	31
22. 16 ff.,	68
22. 18,	97, 193
26. 3 ff.,	68
26. 4,	97
28. 3 f.,	68
28. 14,	97
28. 15,	112
35. 11 and 11 f.,	106, 68
48. 20,	97

EXODUS.

6. 2–8,	69
6. 6 f., 6. 7,	70, 83
11. 5,	200
12. 29,	200
14. 19,	202
15. 16,	69
15. 18,	85
19. 4 ff.,	69
19. 5,	67, 72, 91
19. 6,	71, 72, 117, 197
19. 19,	31
20. 2,	70
20. 22,	31
23. 20,	202
23. 21,	282
24. 3 ff.,	69
24. 7 f.,	67
24. 10 f.,	60
29. 45,	70, 83
29. 46,	70
31. 13,	72
32. 11 ff.,	76
33. 16,	71
33. 19,	85
34. 6, 34. 7,	85
40. 15,	117, 259

LEVITICUS.

10. 3,	74
10. 6,	119
11. 44, 11. 45,	73, 83
cs. 17–26,	66
19. 2,	73
19. 36,	70
20. 8,	72
20. 26,	72, 73
21. 8,	72, 73
21. 15. 23,	72
22. 9,	72
22. 16,	72
22. 32,	72
22. 33,	83
25. 38,	83
26. 11 f.,	70
26. 12,	83
26. 40 ff.,	75
26. 44 ff.,	75
26. 45,	83

NUMBERS.

5. 21,	97
8. 17,	72
11. 16 ff.,	87
11. 25 ff.,	42
11. 29,	87
12. 2,	41
12. 6. 8,	41
14. 13 ff.,	76
14. 18,	85
15. 37 ff.,	81

PAGE

15. 40, ... 73
15. 41, ... 83
18. 19, ... 259
20. 16, ... 202
23. 5. 16, ... 42
23. 19, ... 75
23. 21, ... 106
24. 7. 17, ... 106
25. 13, . . . 117, 259

DEUTERONOMY.

4. 7 ff., ... 71
4. 12. 36, ... 31
4. 35. 39, ... 91
9. 26 ff., ... 76
10. 17, . . . 91, 183
10. 17 f., ... 89
17. 12, ... 200
17. 15, ... 109
17. 18, ... 116
18. 15, ... 299
18. 18, ... 42
18. 20 ff., ... 18
18. 22, ... 144
29. 19, ... 97
30. 1 ff., ... 75
30. 6, ... 87
30. 14, ... 61
32. 6, ... 113
32. 39, ... 91
33. 5, ... 89
33. 29, ... 182

JOSHUA.

3. 11. 13, ... 91
24. 19 ff., ... 73

JUDGES.

c. 5, ... 104
8. 23, . . . 89, 107
20. 28, ... 200

RUTH.

4. 4, ... 40

1 SAMUEL.

3. 1 ff., ... 31
4. 1 3. 18, ... 200
c. 8, 10. 17–11. 15, . . 107
c. 9–10. 16, . . . 107
9. 15, ... 40
9. 16, ... 113

PAGE

10. 6 f., ... 116
10. 6. 10, ... 42
10. 24, ... 109
c. 12, ... 107
12. 3. 5, ... 282
12. 22, ... 75
12. 35, ... 110
13. 14, ... 108
c. 15, ... 113
15. 29, ... 75
16. 8. 10, ... 109
16. 13, ... 116
19. 20 ff., . . . 25, 42
20. 2. 12. 13, . . . 40
22. 8. 17, ... 40
22. 18, ... 118
24. 7. 11, ... 112
25. 28, ... 113
25. 39, ... 41
26. 9 f., ... 112
28. 3. 9, ... 114

2 SAMUEL.

1. 14, ... 112
3. 18, ... 113
5. 24, ... 112
c. 6, ... 114
6. 14, ... 118
6. 16 ff., ... 118
6. 21, ... 109
c. 7, ... 102
7. 1 ff., ... 18
7. 8 ff., ... 191
7. 12–16. 29, . . . 117
7. 14 and 7. 15, . . 112
7. 16, ... 108
7. 23 f., ... 69
7. 27, ... 40
14. 17. 20, . . . 115
19. 27, ... 115
21. 1 ff., ... 119
23. 1–7, . . . 102, 108
23. 2, ... 41
23. 3, ... 43
24. 1 ff., ... 119

1 KINGS.

1. 31, ... 117
1. 35. 40, ... 180
2. 19, ... 111
2. 26 f., ... 118
3. 4 ff., ... 115

PAGE

3. 9, ... 89
8. 14. 55. 65, . . . 118
8. 16, ... 109
9. 4 f., ... 112
9. 5, ... 117
11. 12 f. 32. 36. 39, . . 113
11. 34, ... 109
14. 25 f., ... 157
15. 4 f., ... 112
19. 12 ff., ... 31
19. 18, ... 78
22. 8, ... 144
22. 17 ff., ... 142
22. 24, ... 43
22. 28, ... 41

2 KINGS.

8. 19, ... 112
8. 20, ... 157
es. 11, 12, ... 197
11. 12, ... 116
11. 17, ... 110
12. 5 ff., ... 114
13. 23, ... 75
14. 24, ... 180
15. 9, ... 180
16. 9, ... 142
17. 24, ... 146
18. 4 ff., ... 114
18. 7, ... 114
18. 25, ... 39
19. 34, ... 113
20. 6, ... 113
21. 11 ff., ... 164
c. 22, ... 197
22. 15 ff., . . . 164, 190
23. 4 ff., ... 114
23. 26 f., . . 119, 164, 190
24. 3 f., ... 119

1 CHRONICLES.

12. 18, ... 42
17. 14, ... 109
17. 25, ... 40
22. 10 f., ... 112
28. 5, ... 110
28. 7, ... 112
29. 23, ... 110

2 CHRONICLES.

15. 1 f., ... 42
18. 23, ... 42

PAGE

20. 14 ff., ... 42
21. 16 f., ... 157
22. 1, ... 157
24. 20, ... 42
26. 16 ff., ... 118
30. 9, ... 85
32. 23, ... 116

EZRA.

6. 21, ... 93
9. 11, ... 93

NEHEMIAH.

9. 17, 31, ... 85
9. 30, ... 43

JOB.

19. 26 f., ... 60
31. 15, ... 94
33. 16, ... 40
36. 15, ... 40

PSALMS.

ps. 2, ... 102
2. 2, . . . 110, 282
2. 7, ... 113
2. 8, ... 116
2. 8 f., ... 114
9. 12, ... 111
9. 17, ... 93
18. 22 f., ... 116
18. 29-43, ... 114
18. 43 ff., ... 191
18. 44-46, ... 116
ps. 20, ... 102
ps. 21, ... 102
21. 1. 7, ... 115
21. 4, ... 117
21. 5, ... 110
21. 8 ff., ... 114
ps. 22, ... 303
22. 8. 1. 18, ... 312
24. 1, ... 91
31. 1, ... 78
ps. 32, ... 84
33. 5, ... 77, 96
35. 20, ... 90
36. 5 f. 10 f., . . . 77
37. 31, ... 61, 82
40. 6, ... 41
40. 10 f., ... 77
44. 1, ... 40
44. 9, ... 112

PAGE

ps. 45, ... 102
45. 3, ... 110
45. 4. 6 f., ... 115
45. 4 f., ... 114
45. 6, . . . 111, 117
47. 7, ... 91
51. 11 f., ... 82
69. 27 ff., ... 75
71. 2, ... 78
ps. 72, ... 102
72. 1–7. 12–15, . . . 114
72. 8–11, ... 116
72. 17, ... 97
72. 19, ... 96
78. 70, ... 109
79. 6, ... 93
85. 10, ... 89
86. 15, ... 85
ps. 89, ... 102
89. 14, . . 77, 89, 183
89. 20, ... 109
89. 25, ... 116
89. 26 ff., ... 112
89. 27, ... 116
89. 28, ... 114
89. 28 f. 36 f., . . . 117
96. 6, ... 110
96. 10, ... 89
96. 13, ... 77
97. 2, ... 89
ps. 101, ... 115
102. 8, ... 97
103. 8, ... 85
103. 17, ... 77
104. 1, ... 110
104. 3, ... 195
ps. 110, ... 102
110. 1, . . . 110, 200
110. 5, ... 112
111. 3, ... 110
111. 4, ... 85
116. 5, ... 77
119. 46, ... 41
119. 64, ... 96
129. 4, ... 78
143. 10, ... 82
145. 17, ... 77

PROVERBS.

14. 31, ... 94
16. 12–15, ... 114
17. 5, ... 94
20. 8. 26, ... 114
24. 21, . . . 110, 282

ISAIAH.

1. 18, ... 85
c. 2, ... 153
2. 1 and 2. 1 ff., . . 42, 185
2. 2–4, ... 207
2. 3 f., ... 292
2. 5, ... 73
2. 6–8, ... 72
4. 3, ... 273
4. 5 f., ... 282
5. 9, ... 39
5. 25 ff., ... 153
c. 6, ... 28
6. 3, ... 96
6. 13, ... 159
c. 7, ... 187
7. 7. 16, ... 143
7. 14, 7. 14 ff., . . 280, 149
7. 16, ... 157
7. 17 ff., ... 159
7. 18 ff., ... 143
7. 22, ... 159
8. 1 ff., ... 134
8. 4, ... 143
8. 5 ff., ... 143
8. 6, ... 110
8. 9, ... 208
8. 11 f., ... 28
9. 1, 9. 1 ff., . . 312, 161
9. 4. 6, ... 183
9. 6, 9. 6 f., . . 280, 182
10. 5, 15, ... 95
10. 12, ... 161
10. 13 f., ... 209
10. 21, ... 183
10. 22 ff., ... 159
10. 26, . . . 69, 286
10. 32 ff., ... 160
10. 33 f., ... 143
c. 11, ... 186
11. 1 ff., ... 184
11. 1. 16, ... 69
11. 6 ff., 11. 30. 26, . 99, 276
11. 10, . . 280, 284, 292
11. 11 ff., 11. 11. 16, . 161, 286
11. 14, ... 244
c. 12, . . . 69, 286

	PAGE
14. 14,	196
14. 24 ff.,	143, 160
17. 12 ff.,	160
18. 3–7,	208
18. 4 ff.,	160
19. 1,	195
19. 18–25,	207
19. 19 ff.,	261
19. 23 ff.,	244
21. 10,	29
22. 1 ff.,	159
22. 14 and 22. 18,	39, 147
22. 21 ff.,	183
cs. 24–27,	189
24. 18 ff.,	100
24. 23,	91, 283
25. 7,	292
25. 8,	100, 276
26. 19,	100, 276
27. 9,	264
28. 7, 28. 14 ff.,	60, 159
28. 22,	29
28. 29,	183
29. 5 ff.,	160
29. 7 f.,	143
29. 17,	161
29. 18. 24,	273
30. 1 f., 30. 8 ff.,	42, 134
30. 10,	60
30. 12 ff.,	159
30. 19 ff.,	161, 273
30. 26,	100
30. 27 ff.,	143, 160
31. 5. 8 f.,	143, 160
31. 7 ff.,	161
31. 8,	18
c. 32,	187
32. 3 f. 15,	273
32. 9 ff.,	159
32. 14,	162, 258
c. 33,	160
33. 13,	208
33. 17 ff.,	161
33. 24,	99, 273, 276
34. 4,	100
34. 16,	134
35. 8,	93, 273
36. 10,	39
36. 17,	147
36. 18 ff.,	209
37. 4. 32,	211

	PAGE
37. 11 ff.,	209
37. 22 ff.,	160
37. 33 ff.,	143
39. 5 ff.,	162
cs. 40–66,	22, 77, 78, 138, 168, 191, 210, 212, 213, 288
40. 5, 40. 9 f.,	170, 201
41. 2,	96
41. 10 ff.,	78
42. 1,	170
42. 2 f.,	312
43. 1. 15,	113
43. 10,	191
43. 14,	96
43. 16 ff.,	4
43. 25,	278
44. 3,	170, 273
44. 8,	191
44. 28,	96
45. 1,	96
45. 1. 13,	96
45. 3,	170
45. 6,	170
45. 7–10. 13,	273
45. 11,	113
45. 21,	181
45. 22 ff.,	169
45. 23,	91
46. 11,	96
48. 8,	40
48. 9 ff.,	76
48. 9. 16,	278
48. 16,	42
48. 22,	290
49. 2,	205
49. 6,	299, 314
49. 26,	170
50. 4 f.,	40
50. 5 ff.,	312
50. 11,	290
51. 6,	100
51. 7,	61, 82
52. 5 f.,	76
52. 7,	91
52. 8,	201
52. 10,	170
c. 53,	215, 291, 303, 312
53. 12,	303
54. 9,	170
54. 11 f.,	275
54. 13,	3, 87, 170, 232, 274

	PAGE
55. 3-5,	191
55. 7,	85
55. 10 f.,	17
56. 3 ff.,	275
56. 7,	274
57. 20 f.,	290
58. 7,	94
59. 19,	170
59. 20 f., 59. 21,[1]	264, 42
60. 1 f. 19 f.,	201
60. 13,	275
60. 17,	275
60. 18. 21,	273
60. 19 f.,	275
60. 21,	170
61. 1,	42
61. 1 f.,	302
61. 6,	3, 169, 197, 232, 273, 274
63. 9,	202
64. 4 ff.,	214
65. 8,	215
65. 9,	69
65. 11 f.,	290
65. 15,	97
65. 16,	97
65. 17,	100, 169, 276
65. 20,	99
65. 22,	276
65. 23,	98
65. 24,	273
65. 25,	99, 276
66. 18,	170
66. 18 ff.,	140, 294
66. 21,	169, 197, 232, 273, 274
66. 22,	100, 169, 276
66. 23,	100, 229
66. 24,	290

JEREMIAH.

1. 4. 7,	28
1. 7,	38
1. 9,	42
1. 10,	17
1. 17 ff.,	17
3. 6-6. 30,	164
3. 16 f.,	130, 233, 274
3. 17,	3, 209
3. 21 ff.,	166, 273
4. 2,	97, 209
7. 23,	83
10. 24 f.,	75
10. 25,	93
11. 4,	83
12. 15 ff.,	209
12. 16,	292
12. 17,	293
13. 13,	200
15. 4,	164, 190
15. 16,	42
16. 14 f.,	4, 286
16. 19 f.,	209
17. 19 ff.,	129
17. 25, 17. 26,	189, 129
18. 18 ff.,	129
20. 7-9,	17
20. 9,	41
20. 10 ff.,	17
21. 22. 26,	16
22. 4,	189, 200
23. 5 f.,	188
23. 6,	182, 285
23. 6 ff.,	69
23. 7 f.,	4, 286
23. 16. 18,	16
23.26 f.,	164
23. 28 f.,	17
23. 31,	15
23. 35-37,	52
24. 7,	83, 166, 273
25. 3,	23
25. 9,	96
25. 11 f.,	165
26. 18 f.,	146
27. 6,	96
c. 28,	18
28. 8 f.,	144
28. 16,	144
28. 31,	16
29. 10,	165
29. 12 f.,	166

[1] 59. 20 f., 59. 21. 59. 20 f. is at 264, and 59. 21 at 42. So in other instances, where *two* citations are put in the same line to rectify a late discovered error, and are separated by a comma.

	PAGE
29. 22,	97
cs. 30–33,	165
30. 9,	270
30. 9. 21,	188
30. 10,	292
30. 21,	121, 189, 284
30. 22,	83
c. 31,	69
31. 1,	83
31. 14,	129, 190
31. 29 ff.,	130, 273
31. 31 ff.,	273, 274
31. 33 and 31. 33 ff.,	3, 87, 166
31. 34,	165, 232, 274
32. 8,	38
32. 16 ff.,	52
32. 18,	183
32. 38,	83
32. 39,	87
32. 39 f.,	166, 273
32. 40,	274
33. 2 f.,	52
33. 3,	9, 52
33. 8,	165, 273
33. 8 ff.,	259
33. 11,	129
33. 15,	188
33. 16,	285
33. 17. 21 f.,	189
33. 18 ff.,	196
33. 26,	189
37. 17,	190
38. 14 ff.,	190
38. 21,	42
42. 4,	52
43. 10,	96
46. 26,	209
46. 28,	75
48. 47,	209
49. 6. 39,	209
49. 14,	29
50. 20,	165, 273

EZEKIEL.

cs. 1 and 40,	28
1. 26,	195
2. 8,	42
3. 2 f.,	42
3. 10,	39, 41
3. 17,	29
4. 14,	129
9. 1. 5,	39
11. 5,	42
11. 19 f.,	87, 168, 273
11. 20,	83
11. 25,	42
13. 2. 3. 6. 7. 17,	16
13. 3,	34, 59
13. 22,	144
14. 11,	83
16. 33,	278
16. 60 ff.,	75
16. 61 ff.,	168
16. 63,	168, 278, 289
17. 22 ff.,	189
20. 12,	72
20. 12 ff.,	129
20. 33 ff.,	289
20. 38,	290
20. 41,	76
20. 43 f.,	75, 168
21. 27,	188
22. 8,	129
22. 26,	129
28. 24 ff.,	293
32. 11 ff.,	76
34. 23,	270
34. 23 f.,	188
34. 24,	83
36. 25,	278, 285
36. 25 ff.,	102, 168, 273
36. 26 f., 36. 28,	87, 83
36. 31 f.,	75, 168, 278, 289
36. 35,	99
37. 23,	168, 273
37. 23. 27,	83
37. 24,	188, 270
37. 27,	70
37. 28,	72
cs. 38 and 39,	140, 167, 294
38. 8. 11 ff.,	167, 294
38. 16. 23,	76
39. 6,	167
39. 29,	87, 273
cs. 40–48,	130
40. 4,	39, 41
40. 39,	232
42. 13,	232
43. 2 ff.,	201
44. 5,	39, 41
44. 9,	131
44. 19. 23,	130, 232

PAGE

44. 29, ... 232
45. 8, ... 189
45. 18 ff., ... 130
46. 16 ff., ... 189
46. 20, ... 232
47. 1 ff., . . . 100, 275

DANIEL.

2. 34 ff., ... 195
2. 34. 44, ... 276
2. 44, 2. 44 ff., . . 171, 195
7. 4. 6. 11. 12, . . . 194
7. 8 f., ... 171
7. 11 ff., ... 171
7. 11 ff. 21 ff., . . . 171
7. 13 f., . . 193, 194, 281
7. 14, ... 276
7. 18. 22. 27, . . 194, 276
7. 21, ... 194
7. 22, ... 195
7. 24, ... 195
7. 25 ff., ... 171
8. 11, ... 195
8. 17, ... 171
c. 9, ... 254
9. 22, ... 9
10. 5 ff., . . . 195, 282
11. 35. 45. . . . 171
12. 1 ff., ... 171
12. 2, ... 100
12. 2 f., ... 276

HOSEA.

cs. 1–3, ... 156
1. 2, ... 41
1. 10, ... 273
1. 11, ... 180
2. 18, 2. 18 f., 2. 18 ff., 99, 289, 273
2. 18. 21 f., . . . 276
2. 19, ... 77
2. 20 ff., ... 159
3. 5, . . 109, 110, 180, 270, 282, 289
cs. 4–14, ... 156
5. 10. 12 ff., . . . 155
5. 15–8. 3, ... 289
6. 4, ... 155
6. 7, ... 67
8. 1, ... 67
8. 4, ... 109

PAGE

8. 14, . . . 155, 156
10. 3, ... 109
10. 11, ... 155
12. 2, ... 155
13. 10 f., . . . 109
14. 1. 8, ... 289
14. 2, . . . 232, 274
14. 3, ... 198
14. 4 ff., . . . 159

JOEL.

1. 15. 154
2. 1 f. 11, ... 154
2. 13, ... 85
2. 18–27, ... 157
2. 28, 2. 28 f., 2. 28 ff., 154, 3, 87, 179, 273
3. 1. 7, ... 157
3. 1–18, ... 157
3. 8, ... 206
3. 9 ff., ... 140
3. 18, . . . 157, 158
3. 19, ... 157
4. 18, . . . 99, 275

AMOS.

1. 1, ... 42
1. 3 ff., ... 142
1. 6, ... 157
2. 3, ... 73
2. 5, ... 155, 156
2. 7 ff., ... 73
3. 7, ... 87
3. 8, ... 17
6. 1, ... 155
c. 9, ... 157
9. 10, ... 155
9. 11 f., ... 179
9. 12, . . . 158, 244
9. 13, ... 158

OBADIAH.

21, ... 282

JONAH.

4. 2, ... 85

MICAH.

1. 16, ... 159
2. 12, ... 159
3. 5, ... 144
3. 7, ... 52

PAGE
3. 8, ... 42
3. 12, . . 146, 148, 159
c. 4, ... 9
4. 1–4, ... 207
4. 6 f., ... 159
4. 7, ... 91
4. 8, ... 147
4. 9 f., ... 159
4. 10, ... 145, 147
4. 11–13, 4. 11 ff., 140, 163, 293
5. 1,. 159, 280
5. 2, 5. 2 ff., . . 31, 185
5. 3, ... 147, 159
5. 4 f., ... 140, 146
5. 5 f., ... 293
5. 5 f. 15, ... 163
5. 6, ... 147
7. 7 ff., ... 289
7. 8 ff., ... 163
7. 13, ... 159
7. 15, ... 69, 286
7. 18, 7. 18 ff., . 85, 159, 273

NAHUM.

1. 3, ... 85

HABAKKUK.

c. 1, ... 52
1. 13, ... 78
2. 1, 2. 1 f., 2. 1 ff., . 41, 42, 9
2. 2, 2. 2 f., . . 52, 134
2. 14, ... 209
3. 2, ... 29
3. 9, ... 292

ZEPHANIAH.

2. 11, . . 100, 209, 261
3. 9, ... 209, 292

HAGGAI.

2. 6, ... 171
2. 7 ff., ... 201
2. 21 ff., . . . 171, 193

ZECHARIAH.

1. 9. 13. 14, . . . 41
2. 2. 7, ... 41
2. 10. 11. 13, . . . 202
2. 10 ff., ... 253
2. 11, ... 83

PAGE
cs. 3, 6, . . . 121, 284
3. 8 ff., . . . 193, 198
3. 9, ... 201
c. 4, 4. 1. 4. 5, . . 200, 41
4. 7. 10, ... 201
5. 5. 10, ... 41
6. 4, ... 41
6. 9 ff., ... 193
6. 11 ff., ... 198
6. 13, . . . 199, 201
6. 15, ... 201
6. 16, ... 171
7. 12, ... 43
8. 3, ... 202
8. 4, ... 99
8. 7 f., ... 253
8. 8, ... 83
8. 13, . . . 97, 199
c. 9, ... 182
cs. 9–11, ... 181
cs. 9–12. 160
9. 9, 9. 9 f., 202, 279, 311, 181. 206
9. 10, 9. 14. . 284, 292. 282
cs. 10, 11, ... 182
10. 11, ... 160
cs. 12–14, ... 189
12. 1 ff., . . . 140, 293
12. 8, ... 280
12. 10, ... 273
12. 10 ff., . . . 278, 290
13. 1, 13. 1 ff., 102, 278, 285, 273
13. 9, ... 83
14. 3 ff. 12 ff., . 140, 282, 293
14. 8, ... 275
14. 9. 16, ... 209
14. 16 ff., ... 229
14. 20 f., ... 275

MALACHI.

2. 17, ... 202
3. 1, 3. 1. 5, 269, 282, 291, 121
3. 1–9. 16 f., . . . 202
3. 3 f., ... 201
3. 6, ... 75
4. 5, 4. 5 f., . 299, 269, 291

MATTHEW.

3. 17, ... 31
4. 13 ff., ... 312
11. 10–14, ... 304

PAGE

11. 14, ... 270
11. 25, ... 47
11. 27, ... 304
12. 17 ff., ... 303
16. 16 f., 16. 17. . 301, 47
17. 5, ... 31
17. 10 ff., . . . 270, 304
19. 28, ... 263
20. 20 ff., ... 111
23. 29, ... 263
cs. 24, 25, ... 22
24. 34, ... 263
24. 36, ... 148
26. 54, . . . 2, 303
26. 63 f., ... 301
27. 43. 46, . . . 312

MARK.

9. 12, ... 303
13. 32, ... 148

LUKE.

1. 76, ... 300
2. 31 f., ... 300
4. 21, ... 302
22. 37, . . . 2, 303
24. 4 ff., ... 2
24. 25 ff., ... 303

JOHN.

2. 22, ... 305
4. 22, ... 255
4. 23 f., ... 236
4. 48, ... 23
5. 39, ... 1
10. 35, ... 2
12. 28, ... 31
19. 24, ... 305
19. 37, ... 304
20. 9, ... 305

ACTS.

1. 7, ... 148
2. 39, ... 260
3. 25 f., ... 260
8. 32 ff., ... 303
9. 40, ... 52
10. 9 ff., ... 27
13. 46, 13. 46 f., . 260, 314
16. 9, ... 30

ROMANS.

PAGE

1. 2, ... 2, 5
1. 16, ... 260
3. 1 f., ... 260
3. 29 f., ... 260
5. 15 f., ... 265
6. 23, ... 265
9. 6 ff., ... 260
9. 24 ff., ... 260
9. 25 f., ... 260
10. 12, ... 260
11. 1–10, ... 256
11. 15, . . . 263, 265
11. 25 ff., ... 263
11. 29, . . . 239, 264
11. 31 f., ... 266
15. 8 f., ... 259

1 CORINTHIANS.

12. 13, ... 260
c. 14, . . . 25, 26
14. 18, ... 26
15. 51 f., ... 148

2 CORINTHIANS.

1. 20, . . 2, 297, 300
6. 2. 16–18. . . . 260
6. 16, ... 260
12. 1 ff., ... 27
12. 8 f., ... 51

GALATIANS.

3. 7. 29, ... 260
3. 16, ... 305
3. 28 f., ... 260
4. 21 ff., ... 305
4. 22, ... 260
4. 26, ... 237
4. 27, ... 238
4. 28, ... 260
6. 15, ... 260
6. 16, ... 260

EPHESIANS.

2. 11–22, ... 260
3. 5, ... 261
3. 13, ... 315

PHILIPPIANS.

3. 20, ... 237

COLOSSIANS.

	PAGE
1. 24,	315
3. 11,	260

1 THESSALONIANS.

4. 16 f.,	148

TITUS.

2. 14,	260

HEBREWS.

7. 7,	305
11. 10. 16,	237
12. 22,	237
13. 14,	237

1 PETER.

2. 9 f.,	260
2. 22 ff.,	303

2 PETER.

1. 19,	317
1. 21.	122

1 JOHN.

2. 27,	47

REVELATION.

1. 7,	304
2. 4 ff.,	262, 263
3. 12,	237
3. 21,	200
10. 7,	263
6. 20,	168
21. 2 ff. 10 ff.,*	237

REFERENCES TO APOCRYPHA.

	PAGE
1 MACC. 10. 62 f.,	111
,, 14. 41,	299
SIR. 48. 10 f.,	299

REFERENCES TO RABBINICAL WRITINGS.

BOOK OF ENOCH.†

46. 1, 48. 2 ff.,	194
48. 3. 6,	298
62. 5. 7,	194
69. 27–29,	194

FOURTH BOOK OF EZRA OR ESDRAS.

12. 32 ff.,	194
13. 1 ff.,	194

THIRD SIBYLLINE BOOK.

vv. 286 f.,	195

TARGUM OF JONATHAN ON

Isa. 4. 3, 22. 14, 26. 15–19, 65. 6. 15, at p. 298, and on Isa. 53. 12, at p. 299.
Hos. 14. 9, at p. 298.
Mic. 4. 8, at p. 298.

REFERENCES TO CLASSICAL WRITINGS.

(1) CICERO, *De Divinatione*, i. 50 (113), 51 (117), 57 (129), 30 (63), p. 27.
(2) HERODOTUS, *Historiôn Lógoi*, i. 15, 103–106; iv. 11, 12, p. 164.

* The passage Mic. 4. 10 is discussed at length in *note*, pp. 145–8, and Dan. 7. 13 ff. in *note*, pp. 193–6. Zech. 6. 13, at pp. 199, and Mal. 2. 1 ff. at p. 202.

† English edition of this work by Schodde, Andover, Canada 1882.

C.—MODERN WORKS REFERRED TO BY RIEHM.

AUTHOR.	TITLE OF WORK OR WORKS, ETC.
AUBERLEN, . .	*Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis.* (Clark's Transl. 1856.) See also below: *Mag. and Encykl. Art.*
BAUMGARTEN, .	See below: *M. and E. A.*
BAUR (GUSTAV),	*Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Weissagung.* Giessen, Ricker, 1861,—on Gen. 12. 3, etc., p. 97.
BERTHEAU, . .	See below: *M. and E. A.*
BEYSCHLAG, .	*Die Christologie des Neuen Testamentes.*
BLEEK, . . .	*Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien*, edited by Holtzmann. Leipzig 1862.
BREDENKAMP, .	*Gesetz und Propheten*, 1881.
BUNSEN, . . .	*Bibelwerk*, p. 195 (note).
CASPARI, . .	*Ueber Micha den Morasthiten.* Christiania 1851.
CREDNER, . .	On Joel 3. 19, p. 157.
DELITZSCH, . .	*Die biblisch-prophetische Theologie, ihre Fortbildung durch Chr. A. Crusius und ihre neueste Entwickelung zeit der Christologie Hengstenbergs.* Leipzig 1845. Also various references to Commentaries: *Genesis, Isaiah*, etc., and to his work, *Die Alttestamentliche Weissagung.*
DE WETTE, . .	*Kommentar zur Offenbarung Johannis.* Second ed. edited by Lücke. Passage cited from this work at p. 322 will be found also in the later or third ed.
DIESTEL, . . .	See below: *M. and E. A.*
DRECHSLER, .	*Kommentar zu Jesaias.* Referred to incidentally, note, p. 138.
DUHM, . . .	*Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwickelungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion.* Bonn 1875. Naturalistic standpoint of this work criticised, p. 19.
EISENLOHR, . .	*Das Volk Israel unter der Herrschaft der Könige.* Two vols.
EWALD, . . .	*Gesch. des Volkes Israel* (Eng. Transl., Longmans, Green, & Co.), *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott.*
FRANKE, . . .	*Das Alte Testament bei Johannes.* 1885.
GUTHE, . . .	*De foederis notione Jeremiana.* Leipzig 1877.
HENGSTENBERG,	*Christologie des Alten Testaments und Commentar über die Messianischen Weissagungen.* 3 vols. Second ed., Berlin 1854–57. Its view of mode of revelation to prophets discussed at length, pp. 20 ff. Modific. of views of first by second ed. noted p. 24 (note).
HESS, J. J., . .	*Briefe über die Offenbarung Johannis.* Zurich, Hanke, 1844.

AUTHOR.	TITLE OF WORK OR WORKS, ETC.
HILGENFELD,	*Die Jüdische Apokalyptik.* 1857. Riehm adopts his view of the passage cited from this Third Sibylline Book, p. 195.
HITZIG, . . .	*Die Psalmen.* 1863. *Die Kleinen Propheten.* 1852. (More recent edition by Steiner, 1881.)
HOFMANN, . .	*Weissagung und Erfüllung.* 1841. *Schriftbeweis.*
HUPFELD, . .	*Commentatio de primitiva et vera festorum apud Hebraeos ratione.* 1852.
KAMPHAUSEN. .	Article in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, referred to p. 195 (note).
KEIL, ...	*Kommentar zu Hesekiel* and other Commentaries (Eng. Transl., Keil and Delitzsch Commentaries, T. & T. Clark).
KEIM, . . .	*Geschichte Jesu von Nazara.* (Eng. Transl., Williams & Norgate.)
KNOBEL, . . .	Com. on Numbers, p. 96.
KÖHLER, . . .	*Die nachexilischen Propheten.* Erlangen 1861.
KÖNIG, FR. ED.,	*Der Offenbarungs begriff des Alten Testamentes.* 2 vols. Leipzig 1882. His literalistic view of prophetic revelation discussed at length by Riehm, pp. 29 ff. *Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte gegenüber den Entwickelungstheoretikern beleuchtet.* Leipzig 1884. (Eng. Transl., T. & T. Clark, 1885.)
KÜPER, . . .	*Das Prophetenthum des Alten Bundes.* Leipzig 1870. His view of the "contents" of a prophecy discussed, pp. 9 f. (note).
LÜCKE, . . .	See above on de Wette.
MEYER, . . .	On Rom. 11. 25 ff., p. 265. (Clark's Transl.)
OEHLER, . . .	*Prolegomena zur Theologie des Alten Testamentes.* 1845. See also below: *M. and E. A.*
ORELLI, VON, .	*Die alttestamentliche Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreiches.* Vienna 1882. (Eng. Transl., T. & T. Clark.)
PFLEIDERER, .	*Die Religion ihr Wesen und ihre Geschichte.* Riehm's reference (p. 54) is to the *second*, not to the latest edition. (Transl., Williams & Norgate.)
REUSS, . . .	*Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testamentes.* 1881 (new ed. 1890).
RIEHM, . . .	*Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes.* 1858. *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Alterthums.* 1884. Referred to p. 237 (note) in elucidation of phrase "heavenly Jerusalem." (See also below *M. and E. A.*)
ROTHE, . . .	*Zur Dogmatik.* 1863.
SCHRADER, . .	*Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* confirms Riehm's view of Micah 4. 10 (p. 146).
SCHULTZ, HERM.,	*Alttestamentliche Theologie.* Frankfurt a. Main second ed. 1878. See also *M. and E. A.*
SIMSON, . .	On Hos. 1. 11, p. 180.

AUTHOR.	TITLE OF WORK OR WORKS, ETC.
SMEND, . . .	*Moses apud Prophetas.* 1875. See also *M. and E. A.*
STADE, . . .	See *M. and E. A.* Opinion as to origin of conception, *Kingdom of God*, rejected by Riehm, p. 89.
STÄHELIN, . .	On Zech. 6. 13 (p. 200).
STEINER, . .	On Hitzig's *Kleinen Propheten*, p. 202.
THOLUCK, . .	*Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen.* On mode of revelation to prophets, p. 20 (note). *Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament.* On N.T. citations of O.T. passages, p. 307 (note).
VATKE, . . .	*Biblische Theologie.* 1835. Opinion on *Kingdom of God*, p. 89 (above).
WEBER, . . .	*System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie.* Leipzig 1880. On significance of *bath kōl*, p. 31 and elsewhere.
WEISS, BERN., .	*Das Leben Jesu.* 2 vols., 1882. Second ed. 1884. Third ed. 1888. On historicity of Christ's birth at Bethlehem, p. 312. (Transl., T. & T. Clark.)
WELLHAUSEN, .	*Geschichte Israels.* 1878. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels.* 1883. (Transl. A. & C. Black.) On time when covenant-idea became central in consciousness of Israel, p. 67.
WÜNSCHE, . .	On Joel 3. 19, p. 157.

MAGAZINE AND ENCYCLOPÆDIA ARTICLES REFERRED TO BY RIEHM.

I. *Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift*—Dr. Warneck, referred to p. 210.

AUTHOR.	TITLE OF ARTICLE.
RIEHM, . . .	*Der Missionsgedanke im Alten Testament*, 1880, pp. 453 ff., refd. to pp. 98 and 210.

II. *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung.*

HENGSTENBERG,	*Die Juden und die Christliche Kirche*, May 1857, refd. to p. 268.

III. *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.*

AUBERLEN, . .	*Abhandlung über die messianischen Weissagungen der mosaischen Zeit*, 1858, Pt. iv. pp. 791, 801 ff., 834 ff. Refd. to p. 240, etc.

AUTHOR.	TITLE OF ARTICLE.
BERTHEAU, .	*Die Alttestamentliche Weissagung von Israels Reichsherrlichkeit in seinem Lande*, 1859, vol. iv. p. 603 (refd. to p. 19), and *id.* pp. 595 ff., and v. pp. 486 ff. (p. 133, etc.).
,, . .	IV. p. 352, on Deut. 18. 22 (p. 144).
,, . .	IV. pp. 622 and 626, on historical sense of prophecy (p. 152).
,, . .	IV. pp. 334–353, on unfulfilled prophecy (p. 223).
DIESTEL, . .	*Die Idee der Gerechtigkeit im Alten Testamente*, 1860, vol. v. pp. 176 f. (p. 91).
,, . .	*Die Idee des theokratischen Königs*, vol. viii. pp. 536 ff. (p. 102, etc.).

IV. *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Alterthums*—Riehm.

RIEHM, . . .	"Zeichen und Wunder"—Criticism of Hengstenberg, p. 23.
,, . . .	"Priester," on priestly functions of Davidic kings, p. 118.
,, . . .	"Zeitrechnung," frequently referred to in confirmation of dates given by Riehm.
,, . . .	"Thron," on Zech. 6. 13, p. 200.

V. *Realencyklopädie*—Herzog.

BAUMGARTEN, .	"Ezechiel," on fulfilment of ritual details sketched by Ezekiel (iv. pp. 303 f., first ed.), p. 240.
OEHLER, . . .	"Könige Königthum in Israel," p. 102.
,, . . .	"Messias" (first ed. p. 414), on origin of kingly conception of the Messiah, p. 186.
,, . . .	"Weissagung," vol. xvii., at p. 18 *et passim*.

VI. *Studien und Kritiken.*

RIEHM, . . .	1864, pp. 552 ff., on Johannine Christology. Refd. to p. 2.
,, . . .	1872, pp. 558 ff., on prophet's knowledge of the future. Refd. to p. 50.
,, . . .	1883, pp. 803 ff., criticism of v. Orelli. Refd. to p. 10, etc.
SMEND, . . .	*Ueber die von den Propheten des 8 Jahrhunderts vorausgesetzte Entwickelungsstufe der israelitischen Religion*, 1876, Pt. iv. esp. pp. 622 ff. Refd. to p. 65, etc.

VII. *Pamphlet.*

RIEHM, . . .	*Ueber die besondere Bedeutung des Alten Testaments für die religiöse Erkenntniss und das religiöse Leben der christlichen Gemeinde*, Halle 1864. Refd. to p. 320.

AUTHOR.	REFERENCE.
SCHULTZ, HERM.,	*Ueber doppelten Schriftsinn*, 1866, on acquired Messianic sense of some of Psalms. Refd. to p. 299.

VIII. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*—Stade.

NOWACK, . .	1881, p. 286, on Micah 4. 10. Refd. to p. 147.
STADE, . . .	1881, pp. 1 ff., and 1882, pp. 151 ff., and 275 ff., on date of Zech. 9. 11. Refd. to p. 182.
.. . . .	1881, p. 10, on Zech. 6. 13. Refd. to p. 200.
.. . . .	1881, p. 167, on Micah 4. 10. Refd. to. p. 147.

D.—RECENT LITERATURE ON MESSIANIC PROPHECY, OR ON THE GROWTH OF MESSIANIC IDEA IN JEWISH HISTORY.

(For the part of the lists following which exhibit the principal literature up to 1886, I am mainly indebted to Mr. Stanton's *Jewish and Christian Messiah*; the part dealing with the literature subsequent to 1886, I owe mainly to the courtesy of Dr. P. Schmiedel of Jena.)

I. *Monographs.*

AUTHOR.	WORK.
ANGER, . . .	*Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Messianischen Idee.* 1873.
BALDENSPERGER,	*Das Selbstbewusstein Jesu im Lichte der Messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit.* Strassburg, Heitz u. Mündel, 1888. (For a review of this work, see art. by Rev. A. Halliday Douglas, M.A., *Theological Review and F. C. College Quarterly*, April 1889.)
BARON, . . .	*Rays of Messiah's Glory.* London, Hod. & Stought. 1886. 270 pp.
BRIGGS, . . .	*Messianic Prophecy.* (Aims at complete exegetical treatment of Messianic passages.) Clark, Edin.; Scribner, N.Y. 579 pp.
CASTELLI, . .	*Il Messia Secondo gli Ebrei.* 1874.
DELITZSCH,* .	*Messianische Weissagungen in geschichtlicher Folge.* Faber, Leipzig 1890. 160 pp.

* Transl. by Prof. Curtiss, Chicago. In press, Clark.

AUTHOR.	WORK.
DRUMMOND,	*The Jewish Messiah.* 1877. (Still perhaps the main English authority on this aspect of the subject.)
GLOAG, . . .	*The Messianic Prophecies* (Baird Lecture for 1879). Clark, Edin.
HILGENFELD, .	*Die Jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung.* 1857.
ORELLI, v., .	*Old Testament Prophecy of the Consummation of God's Kingdom.* (Clark's Transl.)
REINHARD, . .	*Der Welterlöser im Alten Testament, ins besondere im Buche Genesis und in den Mythen der Heidenwelt.* Publ. by the author, 1888. 149 pp.
SCOTT, . . .	"Historical Development of the Messianic Idea" (*Old Testament Student*, 1888, 176–180).
STANTON, . .	*The Jewish and Christian Messiah: A Study in the Earliest History of Christianity.* Clark, Edin., 1886. 394 pp. (The latest *great* work of English growth.)

II. *Works dealing in part with the Subject, or some aspect of it.*

ALEXANDER, .	*A System of Biblical Theology.* Edin., Clark, 1888. 2 vols. 960 pp.
BAUER (BRUNO),	*Kritik der Evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker* (see vol. i. pp. 391–416). 1841.
BREUIL, V. DU,	*La Légende du Messie.* Paris 1890. 398 pp.
CANDLISH, . .	*The Kingdom of God, biblically and historically considered.* Edin., Clark, 1884.
COLANI, . . .	*Jesus-Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son temps.* Second ed., 1864.
DALMAN, . .	*Jesaia 53—erläutert.* Leipzig. Faber, 1890, price 1s.
DAVIDSON, S.,	*The Doctrine of Last Things contained in the N.T., compared with the Notions of the Jews and the Statements of Church Creeds.* 1882. ("Mainly occupied with a comparison of different writings of the N.T.; comp. with the 'notions of the Jews' very slightly done."—STANTON.)
DÜSTERWALD, .	*Die Weltreiche und das Gottesreich nach den Weissagungen des Profeten Daniel.* Freiburg-in-Baden, Herder, 1890. 144 pp.
EDERSHEIM, .	*The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Book ii., c. v., "What Messiah did the Jews expect?" 1883.
EWALD, . . .	*History of Israel.* See esp. vol. vi., Eng. Transl., pp. 103–121, besides many scattered notices.
FORBES, . . .	*The Servant of the Lord in Isa.* xl.–lxvi. *reclaimed to Isaiah as the Author from argument, structure, and date.* Edin., Clark, 1890.

AUTHOR.	WORK.
Hellwag, . .	"Die Vorstellung von der Präexistenz Christi in der ältesten Kirche," *Theol. Jahrbb.*, von Baur u. Zeller, 1848, pp. 144–161, 227–240.
Hausrath, .	*History of the New Testament Times* (Eng. Transl., W. & N., 1880). See esp. vol. i. pp. 191–206, vol. ii. pp. 222–251.
Holtzmann, .	"Die Messias-Idee zur Zeit Jesu," *Jahrbb. f. d. Theol.* vol. xii. Heft 3, pp. 389–411. 1867.
Jost, ...	*Geschichte des Judenthums u. Seiner Sekten*, i. 309, 396–97. 1857–59.
Kayser, . .	*Die Theologie des Alten Testaments in ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwickelung.* Ed. Reuss, Strassburg, Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1886. 264 pp.
Keim, . . .	*Life of Jesus of Nazara.* Eng. Transl. (W. & N.). See esp. vol. i. pp. 314–327, vol. iv. pp. 256–343, and vol. vi. pp. 384–end.
King, . . .	*The Yalkut on Zechariah*, translated with Notes and Appendices. Appendix A, pp. 85–108, on Messiah Ben-Joseph. 1882.
Kuenen, . .	*Religion of Israel* (Eng. Transl.), iii. 259–273.
Lang, . . .	"Die Messias-Ideen der Juden," art. in *Zeitstimmen aus der reformirten Kirche der Schweiz*, 1865.
Langen, . .	*Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi*, p. 331–end, "also discussion of documents" (Stanton). 1866.
Lücke, . . .	*Versuch einer Vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes* (4th vol. of Com. on Writings of St. John), second ed., 1852. See esp. pp. 17–212. Riehm quotes from this work, p. 322.
Müller, . .	*Parallelen zu den messianischen Weissagungen und Typen des Alten Testaments aus dem hellenischen Alterthum.* Leipzig 1875.
Neumann, . .	*Die Messianischen Erscheinungen bei den Juden*, 1865.
Piepenbring, .	*Théologie de l'Ancien Testament.* Paris, Fischbacher, 1886. 315 pp.
Riehm, . . .	*Alttestamentliche Theologie*, revised and edited since the author's death by K. Pahnke. Halle, Strien, 1889. 440 pp. See a review of this work by Prof. A. B. Davidson in the *Critical Review of Theol. and Phil. Lit.* vol. i. No. 1, pp. 28 ff.
Römheld, . .	*Theologia Sacrosancta, Grundlinien der biblischen Theologie.* Gotha, Schloessmann, 1888–89, 2 vols. 526 and 616 pp. (Author seeks to prove that Jehovah (*Yah^eveh*) is everywhere to be identified with Jesus.)
Schenkel, . .	Arts. "Messias" and "Messianische Weissagungen" in *Bibel-Lexicon*, 1871.

AUTHOR.	WORK.
SCHLOTTMANN.	*Kompendium der biblischen Theologie des Alten u. Neuen Testaments*, edited by E. Kühn. Leipzig, Dörffling u. Franke, 1889, 192 pp.
SCHULTZ. . .	*Alttestamentliche Theologie.* Fourth (completely revised) ed. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1889. 823 pp. (Exceedingly full on all the elements of Messianic Hope. See esp. Part iv.)
SCHÜRER. . .	*Gesch. des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu.* (Eng. Transl. just completed, 1890, in 5 vols., Edin., Clark. With valuable Index *q. vid.* on "Messiah" and "Messianic Hope.")
VERNES, . . .	*Histoire des Idées Messianiques, depuis Alexandre jusqu' à l'empereur Hadrien.* 1874.
WEBER, . . .	*System der Altsynagogalen Palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Midrasch und Talmud*, 4th Section, pp. 322–386. 1880.
WEIDNER, . .	*Biblical Theology of O.T. based on Oehler.* Philadelphia, Garner, 1886. 224 pp.
WEST, . . .	*Eschatology.* Chicago, Fleming, 1889. 493 pp.
WITTICHEN. .	*Die Idee des Reiches Gottes.* 1872.
YOUNG, . . .	*The Christology of the Targums.* 1853.
ZELLER, . . .	*Theologische Jahrbb. for* 1843, pp. 35–52.
ZÖCKLER, . .	*Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften*, vol. i. third ed. pp. 422–477: *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, von F. W. Schultz, ergänzt von K. v. Orelli. 1888.

III. *Editions of some of the chief Jewish Documents.*

ALEXANDRE, .	*Oracula Sibyllina.* 1869.
DILLMANN, . .	*Das Buch Henoch, uebersetzt u. erklärt.* 1853.
,, . .	"Das Buch der Jubiläen, oder die kleine Genesis; aus dem Aethiopischen übersetzt," in Ewald's *Jahrb. der Bibl. Wissensch.* 1850–51.
FRITZSCHE. . .	*Libri Apocryphi Vet. Test. quibus accedunt Pseudepigraphi selecti.* "For Psalms of Solomon, Fourth Book of Esdras, the Apocalypse of Baruch, and the Assumption of Moses" (Stanton), 1871.
SCHODDE. . .	*Enoch.* Andover 1882. (The *only* Eng. edition of the Book of Enoch.)

GRIMM'S LEXICON.

Just published, SECOND EDITION, REVISED, *demy 4to, price* 36*s*.,

GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

BEING

Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti.

TRANSLATED, REVISED, AND ENLARGED

BY JOSEPH HENRY THAYER, D.D.,

BUSSEY PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM AND INTERPRETATION IN THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

EXTRACT FROM PREFACE.

'TOWARDS the close of the year 1862, the "Arnoldische Buchhandlung" in Leipzig published the First Part of a Greek-Latin Lexicon of the New Testament, prepared, upon the basis of the "Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica" of C. G. Wilke (second edition, 2 vols. 1851), by Professor C. L. WILIBALD GRIMM of Jena. In his Prospectus, Professor Grimm announced it as his purpose not only (in accordance with the improvements in classical lexicography embodied in the Paris edition of Stephen's Thesaurus and in the fifth edition of Passow's Dictionary edited by Rost and his coadjutors) to exhibit the historical growth of a word's significations, and accordingly in selecting his vouchers for New Testament usage to show at what time and in what class of writers a given word became current, but also duly to notice the usage of the Septuagint and of the Old Testament Apocrypha, and especially to produce a Lexicon which should correspond to the present condition of textual criticism, of exegesis, and of biblical theology. He devoted more than seven years to his task. The successive Parts of his work received, as they appeared, the outspoken commendation of scholars diverging as widely in their views as Hupfeld and Hengstenberg; and since its completion in 1868 it has been generally acknowledged to be by far the best Lexicon of the New Testament extant.'

'I regard it as a work of the greatest importance. . . . It seems to me a work showing the most patient diligence, and the most carefully arranged collection of useful and helpful references.'—THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

'The best New Testament Greek Lexicon. . . . It is a treasury of the results of exact scholarship.'—BISHOP WESTCOTT.

'An excellent book, the value of which for English students will, I feel sure, be best appreciated by those who use it most carefully.'—Professor F. J. A. HORT, D.D.

'This work has been eagerly looked for. . . . The result is an excellent book, which I do not doubt will be the best in the field for many years to come.'—Professor W. SANDAY, D.D., in *The Academy*.

'This is indeed a noble volume, and satisfies in these days of advancing scholarship a very great want. It is certainly unequalled in its lexicography, and invaluable in its literary perfectness. . . . It should, will, must make for itself a place in the library of all those students who want to be thoroughly furnished for the work of understanding, expounding, and applying the Word of God.'—*Evangelical Magazine*.

'Undoubtedly the best of its kind. Beautifully printed and well translated, with some corrections and improvements of the original, it will be prized by students of the Christian Scriptures.'—*Athenæum*.

'It should be obtained even at the sacrifice of many volumes of sermons and homiletical aids. There is nothing so intellectually remunerative in ministerial life as foundation work of this kind. Without it no ministry can be solid and strong, nor can its results be profound and abiding. Rarely have Messrs. Clark laid our British Churches under deeper obligations than they have done by the issue of this noble and scholarly work.'—*Baptist Magazine*.

In demy 8vo, price 10*s.* 6*d.*,

THE REDEMPTION OF MAN.

DISCUSSIONS BEARING ON THE ATONEMENT.

By D. W. SIMON, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, CONGREGATIONAL THEOLOGICAL HALL, EDINBURGH; AUTHOR OF 'THE BIBLE, AN OUTGROWTH OF THEOCRATIC LIFE.'

CONTENTS:—Introduction. CHAP. I. The Atonement and the Kingdom of God. II. The Constitution of Humanity. III. Relations of Man to God. IV. Hebrew Sin-Offerings, with Ethnic Parallels. V. The Anger of God. VI. Forgiveness of Sin. VII. Passio Christi. VIII. The Passion of Christ and the Passion of Man. IX. The Atonement and Prayer: an 'Argumentum ad Hominem.' X. The Historical Influence of the Death of Christ.

PRINCIPAL FAIRBAIRN, Mansfield College, writes—'I wish to say how stimulating and helpful I have found your book. Its criticism is constructive as well as incisive, while its point of view is elevated and commanding. It made me feel quite vividly how superficial most of the recent discussions on the Atonement have been.'

'A thoughtful, able, and learned discussion. . . . The author is full of his subject, and handles the literature of it with the facility which comes of sound and laborious application of his mind to it. There is no student of theology who would not be benefited by a careful and respectful study of this volume.'—*Literary Churchman.*

'A book of interest and importance. . . . Dr. Simon throws his heart into his work, and his book is warmed throughout by deep feeling. . . . It is elaborated by Dr. Simon with singular power. Oxford undergraduates, reading for the theological school, will find themselves unable to neglect this work.'—*Saturday Review.*

'Dr. Simon has produced a series of discussions of great value, vigorous, comprehensive in their grasp, philosophical in tone, and rich in theological scholarship. It is lucidly written, and is full of suggestive force.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

THE HEREAFTER:

SHEOL, HADES, AND HELL, THE WORLD TO COME, AND THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF RETRIBUTION ACCORDING TO LAW.

By JAMES FYFE.

'Mr. Fyfe's book seems to us quite a model of analytical study of Scripture teaching, alike in its thoroughness and in the calm temperate way in which the results are given. . . . Once more we emphatically commend the work to all who wish to know what Scripture teaches on this most momentous subject.'—*Methodist Times.*

'A valuable contribution to the literature of the subject, and one that should be read by all who wish to form just and valid views of it.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

'His careful, judicious examination of his material is much to be commended. . . . Much interesting light is thrown upon the whole subject in this volume.'—*Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6*s.*

THE NEW APOLOGETIC;

OR,

THE DOWN-GRADE IN CRITICISM, THEOLOGY, AND SCIENCE.

BY

PROF. ROBT. WATTS, D.D., LL.D., ASSEMBLY'S COLLEGE, BELFAST;

AUTHOR OF 'THE REIGN OF CAUSALITY,' 'THE NEWER CRITICISM,' ETC.

'It is impossible not to confess that in consistency and soundness of argument he often has the advantage over his opponents.'—*Scotsman.*

Just published, in One large Vol., 8vo, price 14s.,

A HISTORY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY
IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

By F. LICHTENBERGER, D.D.,

DEAN OF THE FACULTY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY OF PARIS.

Revised and brought up to date, with important additions specially prepared for the English Edition by the Author.

TRANSLATED BY W. HASTIE, B.D.,

EXAMINER IN THEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

'The theological student, as well as the general reader who is confined to the knowledge of German theology as it is exhibited in the English language, unquestionably requires at the present moment skilled historical guidance, with careful literary and critical orientation, through the dense and tangled growths of the German theology of the century. The present work is offered as specially adapted to meet this want. It may be confidently claimed for it that it is reliable and intelligible throughout, and a safe and easy guide to the theological student as well as to the general reader through the subject. It is the work of a singularly gifted and qualified scholar, who has brought the fullest knowledge and the most patient industry to his task. Grounded not only upon a conscientious study of the sources of the subject, but upon faithful reference to all that has been lately written worth reading upon it, it is pervaded at the same time by a living sympathy for all that is highest and most enduring in modern theological thought, and its representations and judgments are restrained and guided by an independent critical faculty and an earnest regard for practical Christian truth. It is written not only with the full mastery of a matured and vigorous mind, but with the easy grace, the penetrating insight, the keen discrimination, the luminous characterizations, and the clear style of the accomplished French writer.'—*Extract from the Translator's Preface.*

'As to the importance of an accurate and comprehensive history of German theology, diversity of opinion is impossible. . . . We welcome this work as an indispensable aid to the theological student, as a valuable repertory of historical information, and a series of luminous and effective criticisms. Its learning, its calm judicial tone, its fine insight, and its lucidity and candour impart to it quite exceptional worth.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

'Messrs. Clark have seldom or never done a more seasonable, useful, or welcome thing than to publish a translation of Lichtenberger's critical survey of the grand movement of German thought in the province of theology during the last hundred years.'—*Christian World.*

'Such a work speaks for itself. Packed full of information, interesting in style, it will long remain a guide to the complexities of German theology.'—*Methodist Times.*

'The best and most complete work as yet published on the divines of the present century.'—*Church Bells.*

Just published, in post 8vo, price 9s.,

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY,

BEING

THE FIRST EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY GIFFORD LECTURES.

By J. HUTCHISON STIRLING, LL.D. (EDIN.),

FOREIGN MEMBER OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF BERLIN,
GIFFORD LECTURER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, 1888–89.

CONTENTS:—I. The Bequest. II. Natural Theology—How to be Treated. III. Historical Treatment of the Proofs—Anaxagoras. IV. Anaxagoras and design. V. Design generally—Socrates. VI. Design—Plato. VII. The Sophists—their Negative, Aristotle. VIII. Aristotle and the Proofs. IX. The Sects and the Proofs—Cicero. X. The Fathers—Anselm. XI. Introductory—Lord Gifford's Essays. XII. to XIV. The Negative and Hume. XV. and XVI. Kant and the Proofs. XVII. to XX. Darwin and Design.

'Dr. Stirling has done splendid service, both to the history of Philosophy and Theology and to these great sciences themselves. . . . Dr. Stirling excels himself in the chapter on "Aristotle and his Proofs." This is really a magnificent contribution to the history of Philosophy and the right understanding of Aristotle. . . . We ask our readers to read these lectures with care.'—Professor IVERACH in the *British Weekly.*

WORKS BY PROFESSOR A. B. BRUCE, D.D.

Just published, in post 8vo, New Edition, Revised, price 7s. 6d.,

THE KINGDOM OF GOD;

OR,

CHRIST'S TEACHING ACCORDING TO THE SYNOPTICAL GOSPELS.

By A. B. BRUCE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN THE FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

CONTENTS :—Critical Introduction.—CHAP. I. Christ's Idea of the Kingdom.—II. Christ's Attitude towards the Mosaic Law.—III. The Conditions of Entrance.—IV. Christ's Doctrine of God.—V. Christ's Doctrine of Man.—VI. The Relation of Jesus to Messianic Hopes and Functions.—VII. The Son of Man and the Son of God.—VIII. The Righteousness of the Kingdom—Negative Aspect.—IX. The Righteousness of the Kingdom—Positive Aspect.—X. The Death of Jesus and its Significance.—XI. The Kingdom and the Church.—XII. The Parousia and the Christian Era.—XIII. The History of the Kingdom in Outline.—XIV. The End.—XV. The Christianity of Christ.—Index.

'To Dr. Bruce belongs the honour of giving to English-speaking Christians the first really scientific treatment of this transcendent theme . . . his book is the best monograph on the subject in existence. . . . He is evidently in love with his subject, and every page exhibits the intense enthusiasm of a strong nature for the Divine Teacher.'—Rev. JAMES STALKER, D.D., in *The British Weekly.*

'The astonishing vigour and the unfailing insight which characterize the book mark a new era in biblical theology. In fact, as in all Dr. Bruce's writings, so here we find ourselves in the company of one whose earnest faith in the matter of the Gospel narratives prevents him from treating the doctrine of Christ merely in a scholastic style, or as an interesting subject for theory and speculation.'—Professor MARCUS DODS, D.D., in *The Theological Review.*

'A remarkable book.'—*Saturday Review.*

In demy 8vo, Fourth Edition, price 10s. 6d.,

THE TRAINING OF THE TWELVE;

OR, EXPOSITION OF PASSAGES IN THE GOSPELS EXHIBITING THE TWELVE DISCIPLES OF JESUS UNDER DISCIPLINE FOR THE APOSTLESHIP.

'A volume which can never lose its charm either for the preacher or for the ordinary Christian reader.'—*London Quarterly Review.*

'A great book, full of suggestion and savour. It should be the companion of the minister, for the theme is peculiarly related to himself, and he would find it a very pleasant and profitable companion, for its author has filled it with good matter.'—Mr. SPURGEON in *Sword and Trowel.*

In demy 8vo, Third Edition, price 10s. 6d.,

THE HUMILIATION OF CHRIST

IN ITS PHYSICAL, ETHICAL, AND OFFICIAL ASPECTS.

'These lectures are able and deep-reaching to a degree not often found in the religious literature of the day; withal, they are fresh and suggestive. . . . The learning and the deep and sweet spirituality of this discussion will commend it to many faithful students of the truth as it is in Jesus.'—*Congregationalist.*

'We have not for a long time met with a work so fresh and suggestive as this of Professor Bruce. . . . We do not know where to look at our English Universities for a treatise so calm, logical, and scholarly.'—*English Independent.*

'The title of the book gives but a faint conception of the value and wealth of its contents. . . . Dr. Bruce's work is really one of exceptional value; and no one can read it without perceptible gain in theological knowledge.'—*English Churchman.*

LOTZE'S MICROCOSMUS.

In Two Vols., 8*vo* (1450 *pages*), FOURTH EDITION, *price* 36*s*.

MICROCOSMUS:

Concerning Man and his relation to the World.

BY HERMANN LOTZE.

Translated from the German

BY ELIZABETH HAMILTON AND E. E. CONSTANCE JONES.

'The English public have now before them the greatest philosophic work produced in Germany by the generation just past. The translation comes at an opportune time, for the circumstances of English thought, just at the present moment, are peculiarly those with which Lotze attempted to deal when he wrote his "Microcosmus," a quarter of a century ago. . . . Few philosophic books of the century are so attractive both in style and matter.'—*Athenæum.*

'These are indeed two masterly volumes, vigorous in intellectual power, and translated with rare ability. . . . This work will doubtless find a place on the shelves of all the foremost thinkers and students of modern times.'—*Evangelical Magazine.*

'Lotze is the ablest, the most brilliant, and most renowned of the German philosophers of to-day. . . . He has rendered invaluable and splendid service to Christian thinkers, and has given them a work which cannot fail to equip them for the sturdiest intellectual conflicts and to ensure their victory.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

Just published, in demy 8*vo*, *price* 7*s*. 6*d*.,

ELEMENTS OF LOGIC
AS A SCIENCE OF PROPOSITIONS.

BY E. E. CONSTANCE JONES,

LECTURER IN MORAL SCIENCES, GIRTON COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE;
JOINT-TRANSLATOR AND EDITOR OF LOTZE'S '*Microcosmus.*'

'We must congratulate Girton College upon the forward movement of which the publication of this work is one of the first steps. . . . What strikes us at once about the work is the refreshing boldness and independence of the writer. In spite of the long-drawn previous history of the science, and of its voluminous records, Miss Jones finds plenty to say that is freshly worked out by independent thought. There is a spring of vitality and vigour pervading and vitalizing the aridity of even these abstract discussions.'—*Cambridge Review.*

Just published, in demy 8*vo*, *price* 9*s*.,

KANT, LOTZE, AND RITSCHL.

A Critical Examination.

BY LEONHARD STÄHLIN, BAYREUTH.

TRANSLATED BY PRINCIPAL SIMON, EDINBURGH.

'In a few lines it is impossible to give an adequate idea of this learned work, which goes to the very root of the philosophical and metaphysical speculations of recent years.'—*Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

'No one who would understand recent theological trends and their results can afford to miss reading Stählin.'—*Presbyterian and Reformed Review.*

In Two Vols., 8*vo*, *price* 21*s.*,

NATURE AND THE BIBLE:

LECTURES ON THE MOSAIC HISTORY OF CREATION IN ITS RELATION TO NATURAL SCIENCE.

By Dr. FR. H. REUSCH.

REVISED AND CORRECTED BY THE AUTHOR.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH EDITION BY KATHLEEN LYTTELTON.

'Other champions much more competent and learned than myself might have been placed in the field; I will only name one of the most recent, Dr. Reusch, author of "Nature and the Bible."'—The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone.

'The work, we need hardly say, is of profound and perennial interest, and it can scarcely be too highly commended as, in many respects, a very successful attempt to settle one of the most perplexing questions of the day. It is impossible to read it without obtaining larger views of theology, and more accurate opinions respecting its relations to science, and no one will rise from its perusal without feeling a deep sense of gratitude to its author.'—*Scottish Review.*

'This graceful and accurate translation of Dr. Reusch's well-known treatise on the identity of the doctrines of the Bible and the revelations of Nature is a valuable addition to English literature.'—*Whitehall Review.*

'We owe to Dr. Reusch, a Catholic theologian, one of the most valuable treatises on the relation of Religion and Natural Science that has appeared for many years. Its fine impartial tone, its absolute freedom from passion, its glow of sympathy with all sound science, and its liberality of religious views, are likely to surprise all readers who are unacquainted with the fact that, whatever may be the errors of the Romish Church, its more enlightened members are, as a rule, free from that idolatry of the letter of Scripture which is one of the most dangerous faults of ultra-Protestantism.'—*Literary World.*

'We may assure our readers that they will find these lectures throughout to be at once fascinating, learned, and instructive. They are lucid in statement, compact and logical in argument, pertinent in illustration, candid, fearless, chivalrous in spirit, the very model of what such lectures should be.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

In Two Vols., extra 8*vo* (about 1400 pp.), *price* 25*s.*,

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IN UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK; AUTHOR OF 'A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE,' 'SERMONS TO THE NATURAL MAN,' 'SERMONS TO THE SPIRITUAL MAN,' ETC. ETC.

'A remarkable work, remarkable for a grace of style and power of literary expression very unusual in writers on dogmatic theology, and for its breadth of learning and research. . . . Readers will rise from the perusal of the volumes with high admiration of Dr. Shedd both as a writer and as a theologian.'—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

'Dr. Shedd's principles are here, he tells us, to place the Scriptures in the forefront, and next to them, not modern systems or recent treatises on particular points, but the writings of the early Fathers, and of the giants of the Reformation. Dr. Shedd is wise. The old is better than the new, and its virtue has not yet been exhausted. The result of his methods is that he has given us a very solid and sound Calvinistic "system" in which modern theories are weighed, and, as it seems, generally found wanting.'—*The Record.*

'We congratulate Dr. Shedd on the completion of this great work, to the composition of which he has given so many years. We congratulate the readers of theology not only on their possession of it, but also on the fact that they have received it from the author and not from his literary executors. . . . Dr. Shedd's style is such as to render it reasonably certain that his books will be read by more than one generation of theological readers after his personal labours have been closed.'—*Presbyterian Review.*

HERZOG'S ENCYCLOPÆDIA.

In Three Volumes, imperial 8vo, price 24s. each,

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OR DICTIONARY

OF

BIBLICAL, HISTORICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

BASED ON THE REAL-ENCYKLOPÄDIE OF HERZOG, PLITT, AND HAUCK.

EDITED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

'As a comprehensive work of reference, within a moderate compass, we know nothing at all equal to it in the large department which it deals with.'—*Church Bells.*

'The work will remain as a wonderful monument of industry, learning, and skill. It will be indispensable to the student of specifically Protestant theology; nor, indeed, do we think that any scholar, whatever be his especial line of thought or study, would find it superfluous on his shelves.'—*Literary Churchman.*

'We commend this work with a touch of enthusiasm, for we have often wanted such ourselves. It embraces in its range of writers all the leading authors of Europe on ecclesiastical questions. A student may deny himself many other volumes to secure this, for it is certain to take a prominent and permanent place in our literature.'—*Evangelical Magazine.*

'It is with great pleasure we now call attention to the third and concluding volume of this work. . . . It is a noble book. . . . For our ministerial readers we can scarcely wish anything better than that every one of them should be put in possession of a copy through the generosity of the wealthy laymen of their congregation; such a sowing of good seed would produce results most beneficial both to those who preach and to those who hear. But this Cyclopædia is not by any means for ministerial students only; intelligent and thoughtful minds of all classes will discover in it so much interest and value as will make it a perfect treasure to them.'—*Christian World.*

SUPPLEMENT TO HERZOG'S ENCYCLOPÆDIA.

In imperial 8vo, price 8s.,

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF LIVING DIVINES AND CHRISTIAN WORKERS

OF ALL DENOMINATIONS IN EUROPE AND AMERICA.

Being a Supplement to 'Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge.'

EDITED BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., AND REV. S. M. JACKSON, M.A.

'A very useful Encyclopædia. I am very glad to have it for frequent reference.'—Right Rev. Bishop LIGHTFOOT.

'The information is very lucidly and compactly arranged.'—Rev. Canon DRIVER.

'Very useful, and supplies information not elsewhere obtained.'—Rev. Dr. HENRY ALLON.

In Two Volumes, 8vo (870 pp.), price 21s.,

LIVES OF THE LEADERS OF THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL.

FROM IGNATIUS TO THE PRESENT TIME.

EDITED BY DR. FERDINAND PIPER.

'A very interesting and useful hagiology. . . . The collection is one of remarkable value and interest.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

'A really new idea, executed with commendable care and skill.'—*Freeman.*

FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

The following are the Works from which a Selection of EIGHT VOLUMES for £2, 2s. (or more at the same ratio) may be made. (Non-subscription Price within brackets):—

Alexander—Commentary on Isaiah. Two Vols. (17s.)
Baumgarten—The History of the Church in the Apostolic Age. Three Vols. (27s.)
Bleek—Introduction to the New Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
Christlieb—Modern Doubt and Christian Belief. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Delitzsch—Commentary on Job. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— Commentary on the Psalms. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— Commentary on Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— Commentary on Epistle to the Hebrews. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— A System of Biblical Psychology. One Vol. (12s.)
Döllinger—Hippolytus and Callistus; or, The Church of Rome: A.D. 200-250. One Vol. (7s. 6d.)
Dorner—A System of Christian Doctrine. Four Vols. (42s.)
——— History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Five Vols. (52s. 6d.)
Ebrard—Commentary on the Epistles of St. John. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— The Gospel History. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— Apologetics. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Ewald—Revelation: Its Nature and Record. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Frank—System of Christian Certainty. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Gebhardt—Doctrine of the Apocalypse. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Gerlach—Commentary on the Pentateuch. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Gieseler—Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. Four Vols. (42s.)
Godet—Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— Commentary on St. John's Gospel. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— Commentary on 1st Corinthians. Two Vols. (21s.)
Goebel—On the Parables. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Hagenbach—History of the Reformation. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— History of Christian Doctrines. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Harless—A System of Christian Ethics. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Haupt—Commentary on the First Epistle of St. John. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Hävernick—General Introduction to the Old Testament. One Vol. (10s. 6d.
Hengstenberg—Christology of the Old Testament. Four Vols. (42s.)
——— Commentary on the Psalms. Three Vols. (33s.)
——— On the Book of Ecclesiastes. Etc. etc. One Vol. (9s.)
——— Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— Commentary on Ezekiel. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— Dissertations on the Genuineness of Daniel, etc. One Vol. (12s.)
——— The Kingdom of God under the Old Covenant. Two Vols. (21s.)
Keil—Introduction to the Old Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— Commentary on the Pentateuch. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on the Books of Samuel. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on the Books of Kings. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on the Books of Chronicles. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on Jeremiah and Lamentations. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— Commentary on Ezekiel. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— Commentary on the Book of Daniel. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on the Minor Prophets. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— Biblical Archæology. Two Vols. (21s.)
Kurtz—History of the Old Covenant; or, Old Testament Dispensation. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Lange—Commentary on the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke. Two Vols. (18s.)
——— Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Two Vols. (21s.)
Luthardt—Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Macdonald—Introduction to the Pentateuch. Two Vols. (21s.)
Martensen—Christian Dogmatics. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
———Christian Ethics. General—Social—Individual. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Müller—The Christian Doctrine of Sin. Two Vols. (21s.)
Murphy—Commentary on the Psalms. *To count as Two Volumes.* One Vol. (12s.)
Neander—General History of the Christian Religion and Church. Nine Vols. (67s. 6d.)
Oehler—Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
Olshausen—Commentary on the Gospels and Acts. Four Vols. (42s.)
——— Commentary on Epistle to the Romans. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— Commentary on Epistles to the Corinthians. One Vol. (9s.)
——— Commentary on Philippians, Titus, and 1st Timothy. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Orelli—Prophecy regarding Consummation of God's Kingdom. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Philippi—Commentary on Epistle to Romans. Two Vols. (21s.)
Rǎbiger—Encyclopædia of Theology. Two Vols. (21s.)
Ritter—Comparative Geography of Palestine. Four Vols. (26s.)
Sartorius—The Doctrine of Divine Love. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Schürer—The Jewish People in the Time of Christ. Division II. Three Vols. (10s. 6d. each.)
Shedd—History of Christian Doctrine. Two Vols. (21s.)
Steinmeyer—History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— The Miracles of our Lord in relation to Modern Criticism. One Vol. (7s. 6d.)
Stier—The Words of the Lord Jesus. Eight Vols. (84s.)
——— The Words of the Risen Saviour, and Commentary on Epistle of St. James. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— The Words of the Apostles Expounded. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Tholuck—Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. One Vol. (9s.)
Ullmann—Reformers before the Reformation. Two Vols. (21s.)
Weiss—Biblical Theology of the New Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— The Life of Christ. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)

STACKS

Date Due